

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

OUT of a multitude of proposals that have been made for the rehabilitation of religion after the war there are two that stand out prominently. They are made by nearly every one and they are made with emphasis. The one is a simplification of the Christian creed. The other is the end, once for all and absolutely, of all ecclesiastical divisions and ecclesiastical pride.

A volume comes from Cambridge wholly occupied with the subject of *Religious Reconstruction after the War*. That is its title (Scott; 2s. 6d. net). It is called 'a Cambridge programme.' It contains contributions by fourteen prominent Cambridge scholars. One of them is Mr. C. T. Wood, Fellow and Dean of Queens' College, whose subject is 'The Message of the War to the Clergy.' His article ends in this way:

'And lastly, we *must* have reunion in Christendom. It is surely no longer tolerable that bodies of Christians, equally devout, equally effective in missionary work (which is the supreme test), loving the Father, serving one Lord and Saviour, inspired by one Holy Spirit, should go on thwarting each other while the tide of unbelief and wickedness rises unchecked. We *must* have reunion, or the world will find a larger Christianity without us: we *can* have it, giving up nothing that we hold dear except our exclusiveness, if we are equally ready to allow others to give up nothing

which they in their turn hold dear; if we admit, what the facts of history have proved, that our distinctive beliefs are of the "*bene esse*" of Christianity, not of its "*esse*"; if we allow the Church of England to stand on the basis of its own sweet-reasonableness and not on the basis of medieval compulsion. We can have unity on such terms—not uniformity—as the family of God: "Sirs, ye are all brethren." "Whosoever shall do the will of My Father which is in heaven, he is My brother and sister and mother."'

That strong word 'must,' which Mr. Wood himself has cast into italics, we hear on every hand. We hear it at last from a bishop.

In the *Spectator* of the 17th of February there is a letter from the Bishop of Down on 'The Church after the War.' The Bishop of Down is not only one of the most scholarly men in the country, he is also a sane administrator. That he is greatly concerned about the prospects of religion and of the Church this letter is sufficient to show. 'What is to be the position of the Church after the war?' he asks. 'This great human catastrophe cannot leave her as it found her.' Again he asks, 'Is she to come forth from it with new life and power, or is she to perish?' And then he says, 'If the old conventions, the old complications, the old divisions and antagonisms pass on unchecked into

the new age, nothing can save the Church from a most pitiful failure.'

Dr. D'ARCY does not refer solely to the Church of England. That is right. For the Church of England has no monopoly of the pride of position. An eminent bishop went down to Scotland recently to give an address. The building was well filled, mainly with Presbyterians. What did the bishop say to them? He told them that if they would compose their domestic differences speedily he could promise them a hearty welcome into the Anglican Church.

A hearty welcome into the Anglican Church! He did not know those Presbyterians. He did not know that for centuries they had been trusting in themselves that they were right and despising others. He did not know that the others whom they despised were Romans, Anglicans, Baptists—all indiscriminately who had not the privileged position in Scotland of Presbyterians. Dr. D'ARCY does not refer solely to Anglicans. He includes organized Christianity in all its forms, as it exists in these islands, and he is right.

But the Bishop of Down refuses to denounce ecclesiastical arrogance or priestly assumption. Not, he says, because they are not there. But because something more potent than they lie behind them. He calls it the principle of territorial exclusiveness. 'The old proprietor,' he says, 'resents the intrusion of the newcomer who secures a share of his privileges. In the case of a Church this resentment is strengthened and apparently justified by the consciousness of a Divine Mission. Just as the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings seemed to make rebellion impious, so the Divine Mission of the Church seems to make Nonconformity a sin. Logic takes sides with prejudice and makes prescription sacrosanct.'

The combination is potent enough. What are we to do with it? The Bishop of Down courage-

ously and clearly tells us that we must consider God's ways of working. Now we cannot hide it from us, for history affords abundant evidence, that God 'very often makes the Nonconformist His messenger.' And there ought to be no surprise in that. The Nonconformist is not a priest? 'In the history of Israel the prophet is a grander figure and a more potent spiritual force than the priest. The call of God came to the prophet as a voice from above speaking to his heart and conscience, and imposing a mission by direct inspiration. It took Amos from the herds, it brought Elijah from the desert, it found Isaiah as he worshipped in the Temple. The prophet broke in upon the settled order of the Church, and sometimes paid for his intrusion with his life. "O Jerusalem," cried our Lord, "thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee."'

'The prophet alone was not the saviour of Israel, nor the priest. It was the intermingling of the prophetic strain with the priestly that gave to Hebrew religion its spiritual greatness. And the reason why British Christianity has never been able to realize its higher possibilities is because it has failed to combine these two elements. There have been times in the history of the Church of England when she cultivated exclusiveness as if it were a Christian virtue. Impenetrability was regarded as a spiritual excellence.'

'But impenetrability is the mark of the material, the mechanical. Not until British Christianity is able to blend into one life, by a complete interpenetration, all the spiritual elements which are alive and potent in the social system, shall we see the Anglican Communion fit for the great task which God has entrusted to her. What madness to turn away to the alien Communion of Rome, or the remote Church of the East, while excluding the great Christian forces which represent so many mighty prophetic ministries and which have shown so much splendid vitality!' What Dr. D'ARCY pleads for is the recognition of the principle of interpenetrability.

And to that end he has a great and promising proposal to make.

As soon as possible after the war he would establish in this land a Christian Parliament representing all the Christian forces of the Empire. He would have it called together by Royal authority, and he would have given to it power to advise the State on such questions, affecting moral issues, as might be referred to it. Above all, he would have it encouraged to consider the co-ordination of spiritual efforts. And he would have that Parliament become a permanent Imperial Institution meeting at regular periods.

What would be the effect of it? 'It would most assuredly lead to a greater degree of mutual understanding and to a consequent economizing of force. There would be less overlapping and less competition in the religious world. There would emerge a clearer view of the true end of Christian activity and a surer aim. And, above all, there would be attained a real effective unity in some departments at all events of our national religious life.'

The demand for interpenetration after the war seems to be a very simple demand. But it will not be easily fulfilled. The other demand is for a simplification of the Christian creed. It seems to be a tremendous demand to make. But the danger is that it will be fulfilled too easily.

For as soon as men begin to simplify the Christian creed they leave out just the two doctrines that are essential to it. They leave out the Incarnation and the Atonement. And without the Incarnation and the Atonement Christianity is no better than any other religion. It has no power to forgive sin. It has no authority to bring forth Soberness, Righteousness, and Godliness. It is not Christianity.

The Christian creed may very well be simplified. There is probably no Church in the Empire that

could not drop some of its statements of belief without disadvantage. Let them by all means be dropped if they are in anybody's way. It might be well worth while for every one of the Churches to take the occasion, when the war is over, of setting its house in order dogmatically. But to do away with the doctrine of the Deity of Christ and His Atonement for sin is a demand which no Church should for a moment give ear to.

And yet, even in regard to these two essential doctrines of the Christian faith, a simplification may well take place. They may be stated in simpler, more modern, and more sympathetic language. If it is true, and no doubt it is true enough of some pulpits, that the preacher has been running away from the proclamation of the doctrines of the New Testament, it is not because the people would not listen to the preaching of doctrine. It is because he himself would not take the trouble to preach it properly. Two things are necessary. Both demand effort. But he must give it. The first is an intelligent understanding and apprehension of what is meant by the mercy of God in Christ; the next is the announcement of that discovery in language that the people can understand.

Is that too much to expect of the preacher? Even a philosopher can accomplish it. A book has been written by Mr. R. G. COLLINGWOOD, Fellow and Lecturer of Pembroke College, Oxford, and one of our most accomplished philosophical thinkers, to which he has given the title *Religion and Philosophy* (Macmillan; 5s. net).

After much controversy there has come a reconciliation, or at least a truce, between religion and science. Mr. COLLINGWOOD's purpose is to show that between religion and philosophy there ought to be more than a truce, though even that would be something. There ought to be a reconciliation that would be both perfect and permanent. He goes so far as to say that true philosophy and true religion are identical. But what we are concerned

with at present is this. When at last he comes to a philosophical explanation of the Incarnation and the Atonement, he gives us an exposition of those doctrines that is not only theologically quite acceptable, but also quite charmingly simple and attractive.

Wherein lies the difficulty to the modern mind of accepting the doctrine of the Incarnation? We pass the vulgar objection, which science itself is beginning to ridicule, that the Incarnation is a miracle and that miracles do not occur. The difficulty is to understand how one person can be both God and man. That difficulty Mr. COLLINGWOOD deals with. He is not concerned, as he constantly reminds us, to prove that *Jesus* was both God and man. He is a philosopher, not a historian. But this difficulty is philosophical and falls within his province.

The difficulty has to do with the will. Mr. COLLINGWOOD thinks that the makers of our creed were not well advised when they spoke of 'two natures in one person.' For we immediately think of human nature as one definite thing and Divine nature as another. And then there is no language in existence that can intelligibly express the union of the two. It is a question of the will. For now we know enough, both of God and of man, to know that if any man makes the will of God his own perfectly, that man is also God. Godhead is not a matter of omnipotence or omniscience (though these attributes may belong to a God-man as well as to God); it is a matter of willing and doing. And the moment that a man takes the will of God and makes it his perfectly and eternally, that man is God as well as man, and the title of God-man is quite appropriate to him.

And yet the framers of our creed were not altogether wrong when they spoke of two natures in one person. For when the will of man becomes the will of God it is the man's will still. Do you remember the distinction between mysticism and quietism? This is how Mr. COLLINGWOOD ex-

presses it. 'Mysticism asserts the union of my will with the will of God, the total and complete fusion of the two into one. Quietism asserts that my will is negated, that it has simply disappeared and the will of God has taken its place. I am utterly lost in the infinity of God. The two things are really quite distinct; the former asserts a union of two wills in one person, the latter asserts that the person has only one will, and that not his own but God's.'

In a word, and to pass now beyond Mr. COLLINGWOOD into historical Christianity, the Jesus of Nazareth whom we know had a will which was in perfect harmony with the will of God, and yet it was the will of Jesus of Nazareth. No other man has had a will in perfect harmony with the will of God, and we believe that no other man will ever have it. How He came to have the will of a God-man the New Testament tells us in its doctrine of the Incarnation. In its final utterance it opens with the will of God, 'and the Word was God'; and passes to the will of man, 'and the Word was made flesh.'

One of the things which the war will restore to us, says the Rev. J. WESTBURY-JONES, is the doctrine of the Descent into Hell.

Mr. WESTBURY-JONES delivered an address at the Conference of the Countess of Huntingdon's Churches on 'The Influence of the War on our Theology.' The address will be found in the new volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d. net). He does not believe in war. He does not believe that it is 'in the plan of God.' But he believes that it is to be the occasion of the recovery of some doctrines which we had lost.

One doctrine is the supremacy of the New Testament. Mr. WESTBURY-JONES does not repeat the words of Professor Bigg, that the greatest mistake the Church ever made was to bind up the

Old Testament with the New. But he thinks that at least we have been giving the Old Testament a determining voice over our life and conduct to which it is not entitled. Take war itself. 'If,' he says, 'it should be proved that the Old Testament justifies the method of war, while the New Testament entirely condemns it, the result will be that the older book will lose some of its ethical value, and the New Testament will become the one and absolute text-book of the Christian Church.'

Another recovery will be the doctrine of God. The chief mistake we made in our doctrine of God before the war was to exaggerate the value of His immanence. God was becoming everything, and everything was becoming God. After the war we shall make less of the immanence of God and more of His transcendence. For by that time we shall see that God is not responsible for war or any other evil thing, but only for the creation of free personalities.

Then we shall recover—have we not already recovered?—a belief in the life to come. And with that, greatly daring, Mr. WESTBURY-JONES is convinced that we shall recover the practice of praying for the departed. And finally, with prayer for the departed, as soon as it becomes general, we shall recapture, he says, our belief in the Descent into Hell.

For, those of us to whom prayer for the dear departed is new will find the need of encouragement in the practice of it. And he thinks we shall find the encouragement in that 'oft-neglected part of the Apostles' Creed.' That article will send us to the words of St. Peter upon which it is based: 'Put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, in which he also went and preached to the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient.'

'Does Christ still preach to spirits in prison?' we shall ask. And answering by faith affirmatively,

we shall add, 'Why then may not we lift up our heart to Him in prayer on their behalf?'

In our approach to God, whether in public or in private, what ought the first act to be? Ought it to be an act of sorrow or an act of joy? Should we begin with sorrowful confession of sin, or should we begin with joyful confidence in the love of God?

The Rev. F. A. IREMONGER, Rector of Quarley, and formerly Head of the Oxford House in Bethnal Green, says that we ought to begin with the confession of sin. Mr. IREMONGER says so in a book which he has just published, entitled *Before the Morning Watch* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). This, he says, is the order in the public worship of the Church of England, and this order is scrupulously observed. 'In Morning and Evening Prayer, penitence has the first place, not only in the exhortation and confession, but in each one of the sentences with the reading of which the Service opens. In the Litany, the great Intercession of the Church, we begin by praying four times that God will "have mercy upon us, miserable sinners"; and it is only when we have pleaded with Him not to remember our offences, nor to take vengeance of our sins, that we lay before Him the needs of our Church and realm. Both in the Church Catechism, moreover, and in the Communion Service itself, repentance is brought to our notice as an essential condition of rightly receiving the Blessed Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood.'

Those are Mr. IREMONGER's words. And he adds, 'We dare not say that this order is accidental.'

The Rev. Neville S. TALBOT, formerly Fellow and Chaplain of Balliol College, Oxford, does not say that the order is accidental. But he says it is all wrong. He admits that in hymns and liturgies the *prima facie* and predominant emphasis rests

rather on our sinfulness than on God's goodness. But he believes that it was not always so. In the course of the history of Christianity an inversion has come about. And he holds that it is a mistake to ask men, as the Prayer Book now asks them, to 'embark on the overloaded phrases of the General Confession' before they do anything else in their approach to God.

Is it possible that these two men are thinking of two different classes of worshippers? Mr. TALBOT at any rate is thinking of the men at the front, and of them only. He is himself Assistant Chaplain-General, and the title he gives his book is *Thoughts on Religion at the Front* (Macmillan; 2s. net). He admits that the order of the Prayer Book may be justified by arguing that it is there for the use of 'the faithful' members of the Church. But then, he says, we keep on inviting those who are not faithful members of the Church to come to church and engage in its worship. We invite our soldiers to come. And as regards the mass of soldiers he is convinced that it is quite useless to invite them to begin their worship with the general confession of their sins.

Even in the Eucharist, when we come to it, a preponderating stress, he believes, is laid upon the Cross as an offering for sin. He says that everything can be found in the Eucharist, but what we ought to find in it first is the declaration of the love of God. It is only the love of God that can evoke sorrow for sin. What is the use of calling for confession before the heart has been touched to penitence? 'The great wonder - compelling revelation of God has been overlaid and disguised. He seems in the Eucharist—mainly and *prima facie*—to be the Father sitting back in reception of placation, and we hardly see Him, in the "precious death and Passion," as the Father who, while we are a great way off, runs out to fall on our neck and bring us home.'

Mr. TALBOT is thinking of the 'flying boys who, more than any one else,' he says, 'are winning our

battles (I have been chaplain to a squadron of them for a little time). They are far from un sinful, but they will nevertheless, I am sure, not *begin* with the avowal "that there is no health in them"; they will not sing "that they are weary of earth and laden with their sins." For as they live gaily and unconcernedly on the edge of things, they know that that is not the primary truth about themselves.'

Here then is a situation of utmost interest and urgency—not for the Church of England alone but for the whole Church of God throughout the world. It is no longer a question merely of the approach to God in public worship. It is a question of the approach to God itself, whether in public or in private, whether when we have entered with the assembly into the house of God or have entered into our own closet and have shut to the door. Is our approach to God to be in the consciousness that we are miserable sinners who have done evil in His sight and ask His forgiveness for Christ's sake; or is it to be in the consciousness that our record of life is a reasonably good one until now, and so counting on His glad and loving reception of us?

Mr. TALBOT has this advantage over Mr. IREMONGER, that if true penitence is demanded of every worshipper in his approach to God, very few will be the number of sincere worshippers. Mr. IREMONGER recognizes that advantage. He has not seen Mr. TALBOT'S book, for they have been published within a few days of each other, but he recognizes the difficulty which Mr. TALBOT'S book is written to express. The invitation, he says, is to every one that thirsteth. But what of those who do not thirst?

He sees the difficulty and the magnitude of it. There are times when he feels that it is almost overwhelming. 'As we look out upon the world,' he says, 'we see great streams of life going by and leaving the Church altogether on one side, in a spirit of ignorance, hostility, or indifference. How

many, for instance, of those whose names are famous in literature, science, art, and economics, the great constructive and creative spheres, are in direct communion with the Church? Is it not clear that for them the Church, as we understand it, simply does not count? This would be generally admitted. Nor is it material for the present purpose that a long list has been published of eminent scientists who believe in God. This only makes the problem more difficult than ever. The longer the list, the more serious becomes the outlook for the Church. For if such be their faith, why have they not joined "the great congregation"? Why is it that there is so little of anything which is dynamic or corporate in their faith, and how can we explain the infinitely small percentage of those admitting their belief in God, who are open and professed communicants of the Church? It is not altogether surprising that those who deliberately sin against the light, either in faith or conduct, will have little to do with the Church: but it should give us reason for serious thought, that we know men and women who would call themselves God-fearing, even Christian, who can recognise no resemblance between the faith which they hold and that of the Church which was intended to include and to inspire them.'

Mr. TALBOT meets the difficulty by saying that we must take such men as they are. But Mr. IREMONGER will have none of that. On the contrary, he holds that all these men are guilty of sin and that nothing can be done with them until they are brought to a sense of it. They are not only guilty of sin in general; they are guilty of two sins in particular. And they are all guilty of them, whatever their private lives may be. These two sins—Mr. IREMONGER calls them 'great sins of condition'—are the sin of independence of God and the sin of self-satisfaction.

The first is the sin of independence of God. Our Lord had much to say about that sin. We shall search the New Testament in vain for the

actual word, but the idea is everywhere. It is the beginning of the Prodigal's history—'Give me the portion of goods that falleth to me.' It was the sin of the unbelieving Jews—'Ye will not come to me that ye might have life.' It was the danger of which even the disciples were warned—'without me ye can do nothing.' It is the Great Refusal, says Mr. IREMONGER. It is to shut and bolt and bar the door in the face of God. It is to boast that without Him we can do everything, that we recognize no claim of His upon our lives. Every man who is guilty of the sin of independence of God must be brought to a knowledge of it.

The other sin is self-satisfaction. It is the particular sin of the Pharisees. The typical Pharisee who went up to the Temple to pray prayed the prayer and sinned the sin of self-satisfaction. It was the sin of the unbelieving Jews generally. 'If ye were blind,' said our Lord to them, 'ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see, therefore your sin remaineth.' It is the sin of Sir Oliver Lodge, and of all those for whom he spoke when he said that in the present day men are thinking of nothing so little as of their sins. Did not even Professor J. H. Muirhead, who is no theologian, rebuke this sin and call for repentance when he said, 'There can be no deep religious sense in a soul which does not bear about with it the marks of a life and death struggle, which has not had its vision of the Holy Grail, and been surprised thereby into a sense of the distance between the ordinary level of feeling and achievement, and the height to which it has been called.'

And yet, who is it that has our sympathy to-day? Is it Mr. IREMONGER, demanding a general confession of sins, or Mr. TALBOT, imploring that his flying boys be accepted as they are? Is it not Mr. TALBOT? And has not Mr. TALBOT even the right of it theologically? Does not the recognition of the love of God in Christ precede all sense of sorrow for sin? Is it not the cause of it?

The Commentaries of Principal James Morison, D.D.: an Appreciation.

BY THE REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, D.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND BIBLICAL
CRITICISM IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

THE celebration last year of the centenary of Dr. James Morison's birth served not only to recall many interesting and stirring events in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, but to reawaken interest in a series of Commentaries which formed one of the most important contributions of British scholarship to the interpretation of the New Testament in the nineteenth century, and which may be studied with advantage even in the changed circumstances of our own day.

The principal of these Commentaries are: *An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 1849; new edition, rewritten, with addition of tenth chapter, 1888; *A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 1866; *A Practical Commentary on . . . S. Matthew*, 1870; *A Practical Commentary on . . . S. Mark*, 1873; *S. Paul's Teaching on Sanctification: a Practical Exposition of Romans vi.*, 1886.

Apart from the massive learning they display, the outstanding feature of these Commentaries lies in the close study of the exact words of Scripture which they exhibit throughout. In them the well-known dictum of Origen that 'there is not one jot or one tittle written in Scripture which does not work its own work for those who know how to use the force of the words that have been written' is continually finding fresh illustration. And we are not surprised, therefore, to find Dr. Morison placing in the forefront of one of his principal works the following quotation from Abraham Tucker's *The Light of Nature Pursued*: 'Come, then, thou solemn power, Philology, pioneer of the abstruser sciences, to prepare the way for their passage, . . . lend me thy needle-pointed pencil, that I may trace out the hair-breadth differences of language.'

It is, indeed, this philological sense and the desire for the minutest accuracy that lead to the attention bestowed upon various readings, and the renderings not only of the ancient versions, but of our early English translators. Wycliffe, Purvey,

and others, are all laid under contribution, often with the happiest results, in the anxiety to bring out the full force of the original.

And to the same cause we may probably trace the constant references to the conflicting views of other commentators. It is a mode of commenting which, in less skilful hands, easily becomes wearisome and confusing. We are content as a rule to know the result at which a writer has arrived after full study of all the evidence within his reach. But this did not satisfy Dr. Morison, and with characteristic modesty he has told us why. 'He assumed that his readers would really feel no particular interest in finding out *his* particular standpoint.' And, as for himself, he felt 'a genuine interest in going round among the various standpoints that have been occupied by other earnest thinkers.' It was not that he was unable to make up his own mind. But so eager was he to guard his readers from 'crotchets, partialities, and ideal pets,' that he delighted in presenting his subject from a multiplicity of standpoints.¹ And therefore it was that to the most polemical of all his works, the first edition of his *Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, he prefixed the words of Melancthon: '*Pugnabo pro Sacris, et solus, et simul cum aliis.*'

It might perhaps be thought that comment so philological and bibliographical as Dr. Morison's would be very unreadable, but this is far from being the case. Many of his books took shape first in the form of lectures delivered to large popular audiences, or underwent the still harder ordeal of the criticisms of the students of the Theological Academy, before they reached a wider public. And the result is a freshness and even liveliness, which we do not usually associate with commentaries, and a richness of illustration and citation, drawn often from very unexpected sources. The most homely figures are appealed to, if only

¹ *Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, p. ix.

they throw light on the points that are being discussed, or lead further on into the truth as it is in Christ.

For it is the *religious* meaning and drift of the books he is expounding that is always Dr. Morison's principal aim. For him the Bible, far from being a collection of curious and interesting texts on which scholarship might exercise its ingenuity, is the Book of God—God's voice of comfort to the broken and bruised heart, God's 'own imperative' to the sinful and rebellious will. Hence in the Dedication prefixed to the first edition of the Commentary on Rom. ix., his call to 'the Reverend the Professors of Theology in the Established and Unestablished Churches in Scotland' to devote themselves to 'the interpretation, elucidation, and vindication' of the Divine doctrines contained in this and similar chapters. 'Up, O up,' he earnestly pleads, 'to this employment!'

It was a call he had a right to make, for nobly had he led the way in his own preaching and teaching in showing that Scripture exposition is Scripture explication—the unfolding of the thoughts enfolded in the Sacred Text.

As we look back, then, upon Dr. Morison's Biblical work as a whole, we find it marked by three features.

(1) The first is *thoroughness*. He spared no pains to equip himself thoroughly for his task. And there are few more striking pictures in the history of theological study than that of the eager scholar rising about half-past three in the morning, and betaking himself through the quiet streets of Kilmarnock to the Old Manse where he kept his books, there to spend four or five hours in uninterrupted study before the distractions of the day began.

Nor did he only amass knowledge, he knew how to use it. Never for a moment does he give the impression of being crushed under the load of his varied learning. He turns all to account as a master, and with rare skill and judgment, and above all with a saving common-sense which is very refreshing, sets himself to disentangle the truth out of the cloud of sophistries with which it is so often accompanied.

(2) It was this very *independence of thought*

which led to his losing his place in the communion in which he had been brought up. 'I cannot make any compromise with regard to what I believe to be God's eternal truth,' he said at the Synod at which he practically bade farewell to the Secession Church. And though for a time he had to stand 'alone—terribly alone,' he was spared to see the reward of his struggle in a wider apprehension of God's purposes of saving grace, and to win the veneration and affection of all who knew him by the Christlike beauty of his own character and life.

(3) For of the intense *spirituality* of Dr. Morison's nature there cannot be a moment's doubt. If some of his earlier books were called forth in the heat of controversy, in defence of the 'new views' which were to cost him so dear, he never allows himself to be betrayed into bitterness or recrimination towards his opponents. And it is significant of his whole attitude that when he came to publish a second edition of his Exposition of Rom. ix., he completely rewrote and remodelled it, laying down, as he himself puts it, the sword, and taking up the sickle, 'substituting scientific and scientifically practical exegesis in place of controversial discussion' (p. viii).

It was the positive side of truth with which he was always mainly concerned, the effort to find out the mind of the Spirit as it reveals itself in the words of Scripture, and above all to hold up steadily Him in whom all Scripture centres. 'Doctrine,' so he declares, in a sermon included in the memorial volume entitled *Sheaves of Ministry* (p. 375 f.), 'in its own place is most excellent. It is indispensable. In particular the doctrine of the inspired writers is of inestimable value. . . . Doctrine is a telescope by which you can see the Saviour afar through intervening centuries and ages of ages. Doctrine is a microscope, which, when turned to the world within the heart of the Saviour, reveals the presence in it of all peoples and all persons. . . . But still it is no mere doctrine that is, or can be, our Saviour. . . . It is not so much Christianity as it is Christ that we need. It is'—and here he strikes the keynote of all his teaching—'*Christ for every man!*'

'Hallowed be Thy Name.'

A JOHANNINE INTERPRETATION.

'Glorify thy name.'—Jn 12²⁸.

BY THE REV. E. F. MORISON, D.D., ROSSLYN CHAPEL.

IN any investigation of this first petition of the Lord's Prayer we have no need to perplex ourselves with questions of textual criticism, for both Matthew and Luke record the words in a precisely identical form. Further, we may also allow that with regard to its interpretation there is no reason why this petition should not be the first of those which we address to God, for just as in the invocation we call upon God by His Name 'Father,' so here we pray that the Divine Name, as thus revealed, may everywhere be sanctified, recognized as holy.

The connexion, however, between the title of the invocation and the meaning of this clause has, perhaps, not always been sufficiently realized by expositors of the Lord's Prayer. It is, no doubt, true that the expression 'Let thy name be hallowed' has a general significance, that it is a prayer for the growth and spread of true religion: 'The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom' (Pr 9¹⁰), and 'Unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise' (Mal 4²). In this same sense also we may say that the first petition of the Lord's Prayer is a true 'Missionary Prayer,' a prayer for the expansion of the knowledge of the Lord, as is further exemplified by the language of the Apocalypse: 'Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy righteous acts have been made manifest' (Rev 15⁴).

Yet we may surely see a more particular meaning in this prayer for the sanctification of the Divine Name. The expression, of course, has its roots in the past, is illustrated by prophet, lawgiver, and psalmist, but in the model prayer for the followers of Christ it has also a further implication: 'May Thy Name Father be hallowed and revered by those who must become as little children before they can enter the Kingdom of Heaven.' The simple and spontaneous address 'Father' of the invocation may indeed be said to influence every word of the prayer thus directed to Him. 'They that know thy name,' says the Psalmist, 'will put

their trust in thee,' and those who call upon God as Father, and have a true faith in His fatherly love, may well pray that this one, great, and all-important fact of the Fatherhood of God may be realized, that all the implications of the supreme revelation, the Name *Father*, may come to be fully recognized by the whole human race. There is thus something deeper, more personal and more vital, in such a prayer than a mere pious aspiration for the furtherance of religion. It is not a conventional liturgical formula, as in the Jewish petition, 'Let His great Name be blessed for ever, and to all eternity,' but the fervent expression of an earnest desire that each and all of God's children may find their true home 'in the kingdom of their Father' (Mt 13⁴⁸).

It would, perhaps, be difficult to find a more familiar Jewish term than the expression 'the name of the Lord.' In the Decalogue the command is given, 'Thou shall not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain' (Ex 20⁷); and in the Levitical Code speaking against God is described as 'blaspheming the name' (Lv 24¹¹). Further, the House of God is described in Deuteronomy as 'the place which the Lord shall choose to cause his name to dwell there' (Dt 12¹¹). In the prophecies of Ezekiel we read, 'And I will sanctify my great name, which hath been profaned among the nations, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the nations shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes' (Ezk 36²³). It cannot be said that there is not good authority in the Scriptures of the Old Testament for the 'hallowing' of the Divine Name.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, however, gives a plainer meaning and a more definite content to the expression, 'the name of the Lord.' It is no longer an equivalent for the gradual and partial revelation of the character of God, whether to the Gentiles amongst whom He 'left not himself without witness' (Ac 14¹⁷), or even to the Jews to whom He was known as 'Jehovah, the God of Israel.'

For Jesus the Divine Name is simply 'Father,' and it is for the hallowing of that Name, in some sense 'a new name,' that He bids His disciples pray. We do not, if we pray in the spirit of Christ, address our prayers to Jehovah, 'the glorious and fearful name' (Dt 28⁵⁸), nor do we pray that the nations of the world may praise His 'great and terrible name: holy is he' (Ps 99³), but rather we make petition to our Heavenly Father that 'thy name may be known upon earth, thy saving health among all nations' (Ps 67²).

It may seem strange that in the life and words of our Lord as recorded by the first three Evangelists there should be no further mention of the hallowing of 'the Name.' Other clauses of the Lord's Prayer have their counterpart in sayings of our Lord spoken on other occasions, but in this case, apparently, there is no exact parallel to be found in these Gospels to this prayer for the sanctification, the devout recognition of the Divine Name *Father*. Possibly this is due to the fact that our Lord deliberately refused to employ the expression 'the Name' as a periphrasis for God, and chose to speak of Him directly as 'Father,' 'my Father,' or 'your Father.' The phrase, therefore, has here a special significance as employing a term which in itself was not customary to our Lord. At the same time, however, a prayer which was definitely and immediately addressed to God as Father could safely and rightly include a petition for the worship of His Holy Name, a fervent prayer that others may come to join their prayers with those who call upon God as the Father of all. The Lord's Prayer is the great 'Family Prayer.' We are bidden to pray for the advent of the Kingdom, for the fulfilment of the Divine Will, but first and foremost, as including all else, we pray that the whole Household of God may be led to realize their birthright, 'the right to become children of God' (Jn. 1¹¹).

When we turn to the Gospel according to St. John we find that, in contrast to the Synoptists, 'the Name' of God is repeatedly mentioned, and there is much that serves to illustrate our Lord's use of the expression 'May thy name be hallowed' in His pattern prayer. We have already remarked that the clause is no mere liturgical formula, or an ascription of praise inserted in accordance with the Rabbinic principle, 'A benediction that does not mention the Name is no benediction at all.' It must be noticed, however, that although in the

Fourth Gospel God's Name is not infrequently spoken of, yet it is always in a direct personal relation, 'thy name,' or else with immediate reference to the Divine Fatherhood, 'the name of the Father' or 'of my Father.' The prayer of our Lord which is given in chapter 17 of the Gospel makes mention of the Name of the Father no fewer than four times. 'I manifested thy name unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world' (v.⁶). 'Holy Father, keep them in thy name which thou hast given me' (v.¹¹). 'While I was with them, I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me' (v.¹²). 'I made known unto them thy name, and will make it known' (v.²⁶). These passages make it clear that here, at any rate, the 'Name' of God is not a vague generalization, or a convenient alternative, it is rather 'a new name' given to the Son that He may reveal it to His followers and keep them in it, making all one in the one great Family of God their Father.

It is interesting also to notice that in this prayer we have the term 'hallow' or 'sanctify' used, however, not in connexion with the Name of the Father, but with reference to the Son and His disciples. 'For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth' (v.¹⁰). So also our Lord prays, 'Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth' (v.¹⁷). Such sanctification is, no doubt, primarily personal, but it is also altruistic and progressive. We can thus see that the petition, 'May thy name be sanctified,' as taught by our Lord, is meant to be something more than a prayer merely for personal holiness in the heart of the individual. The more we desire and pray for our own growth in holiness, our own 'consecration,' the more we realize the far-reaching nature of this prayer with its sublime unselfishness. Our holiness before God is not merely our own private concern, it is of infinite value for its wider social aspects, as promoting the progress of the Kingdom. Thus in the Sermon on the Mount our Lord enjoins upon His followers, 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven' (Mt 5¹⁶).

In this connexion it is worth remembering that not only is the Name of the Divine Father glorified by men in expressions of worship and thanksgiving, but God Himself is said to 'glorify' His Name. Thus in the Fourth Gospel our Lord prays to His

Father in the words 'Glorify thy name' (Jn 12²⁸). The answer to this prayer was given, we are told, by 'a voice out of heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.' It is difficult not to see here a reference to the Divine Fatherhood. The glory of God consists in giving to men the filial spirit, the Spirit of the Son, whereby they feel God to be their Father. The Fourth Gospel is most emphatic in maintaining that the glory of the Father and of the Son is one and mutual, the Father glorifies the Son by His loving care, and the Son glorifies the Father by His loving obedience. The most glorious act of Sonship is the death upon the cross, whereby He was made 'perfect through sufferings' (He 2¹⁰). In the account of the Betrayal of our Lord, as given in the Fourth Gospel, we are told that, after the departure of Judas from the upper room, 'Jesus saith, Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him' (Jn 13³¹). It is in times of great distress and mental conflict, when His 'soul is troubled,' that the Son of God glorifies the name of the Divine Father by His obedience. Thus we find that in this Gospel our Lord prays in the words, 'Father, the hour is come: glorify thy Son, that the Son may glorify thee' (17¹), and again, 'I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do' (17⁴). Further, when making supplication for His disciples, He prays, 'Keep them in thy name which thou hast given me, that they may be one, even as we are' (v. 11). 'The glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them (v. 22). The prayer ends

with the words, 'O righteous Father, the world knew thee not, but I knew thee; and these know that thou didst send me; and I made known unto them thy name, and will make it known; that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them' (vv. 25, 26).

These quotations have here been given at length in order to show how this long intercessory prayer of our Lord which is recorded in the Fourth Gospel expounds and illuminates the brief petition which He bade His disciples pray, 'Hallowed be thy name.' The example of the Son of Man is valid for all mankind. His life and death were a complete 'hallowing' of the Divine Name, a most sacred revelation of the Fatherhood of God. To the precept, 'Ye shall be holy, for I am holy' (Lv 11⁴⁵), is added the pattern of the sinless Christ, whereby we may be perfect even as the 'heavenly Father is perfect' (Mt 5⁴⁸).

The first petition of the Lord's Prayer is thus universal and all-inclusive, a true missionary prayer that the Name of God may be made known to all men; for wherever the love of the Father is proclaimed and known, the Kingdom is come, and whenever the message of the Divine Fatherhood is received into the hearts of men and realized, 'glorified,' in a life of loving obedience, the Will of God is done. It is therefore evident that it is not in the conventional language of devout aspiration, but in the truest filial piety that we pray, 'Hallowed be thy name,' believing that our Lord Himself in His own prayers, to His heavenly Father used the words, 'Glorify thy name.'

Literature.

HERBERT SPENCER.

If an editor has to choose between an author who knows the subject well and an author who can write well, what should his choice be? Fortunately, the choice has rarely to be made. When the editor of the series entitled 'Makers of the Nineteenth Century' selected Mr. Hugh Elliot for the biography of *Herbert Spencer* (Constable; 6s. net), he selected one who could write with force and with finish, and one who had read the whole of Spencer's works right through twice.

But that is not the end of an editor's duty. He must find a man who is in sympathy with his subject. For we have no longer any pleasure in the slashing review, or in any other slashing thing. We know now that nothing is done well that is not done sympathetically. Is Mr. Hugh Elliot a Spencerian?

He is. But just because he is a Spencerian he criticizes Spencer. Raising the question at the end of the book as to the right of Herbert Spencer to a place among the Makers of the Nineteenth Century, he says this:

'If we wish to estimate his real greatness, apart from the adventitious fluctuations of his environment, we shall inquire, not what was thought of him at different times, but what he did. We shall find that, without money, without special education, without health, he produced eighteen large volumes of philosophy and science of many diverse kinds; that he invented an entire new system of philosophy which for half a century filled the attention of all thinking people; that he led the chief controversies on Evolution and Biology without ever having received any tuition in those subjects; that he wrote perhaps the most important text-book of Psychology of his century, without any acquaintance with the works of his predecessors, and scarcely any with those of his contemporaries; that he established the science of Sociology in England; that in all branches of so-called Moral Science he was recognized as a leader; that he became the philosophic exponent of nineteenth century Liberalism; that he published a variety of mechanical inventions; and that on endless other subjects, great and small, he set forth a profusion of new and original ideas. A stable judgment will recognize in these achievements a true greatness, that may withstand all passing gusts of popular opinion.'

But that judgment does not close the mouth to criticism. Rather does it invite the frankest criticism that is also fair. And so Mr. Elliot criticizes. On Spencer's doctrine of the 'Unknowable,' for example, developed by him into a kind of substitute for religion, he speaks his mind and has no mercy. And of Spencer himself he even asserts on one occasion that he was less than his work, which is surely a difficult proposition to prove. His words are: 'He was one of those authors of whom it may be most truly said that his works were much greater than himself; and all the best of him will be found in his philosophy. His personality, outside his works, was meagre and petty. In this biography, therefore, I shall devote the greater part of the space to an account of his writings, in which he sacrificed the greater part of his personality.'

And this biography contains the clearest general account of Herbert Spencer's philosophy that has yet been published.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION.

Keen as our interest is in the psychology of religion, and has been ever since Professor William

James made its study attractive, few of us have been altogether without a sense of uneasiness. For it appeared as if the fundamental fact of the Christian life, that is to say, the initial fact of regeneration, and for that matter all its subsequent facts, were henceforth to be explained as matters of purely psychical experience, due to one's time of life or perhaps to one's emotional organization.

Professor James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D., who has written a large and able book on *The Psychology of Religion* (Revell; \$1.50 net), goes a long way towards delivering us from that uneasiness. He uses the word 'psychology' in a large sense; indeed, with very great freedom. For he speaks not only of the psychology of the soul, but afterwards also of the psychology of the sermon. What he does, in short, is to take as much of the science of psychology as suits his purpose and no more, his purpose being to express the old facts of Christian experience in modern and, as far as possible, scientific language.

The chapter on the psychology of the sermon, in spite of its curious title, contains good and useful reading. Especially effective is his advice as to the style in which the sermon is to be written. That advice he carries on throughout the following chapter, on the psychology of preaching, from which we take this short paragraph: 'The great literary writers are constantly showing us that the simple truth told in the most direct words, adorned only with choice diction, is the most effective as well as the most beautiful style. John Stuart Mill, that master of simple, forceful English, once wrote the sentence, "This is a very strong statement," and then struck his pen through the word "very." A friend, seeing the manuscript, asked why he had done this. "Because," said Mr. Mill, "I wanted to make that statement as strong as I could." To his mind the sentence, "This is a strong statement," was a stronger statement than the sentence, "This is a very strong statement," and he was right.'

CAUSE AND EFFECT.

In the great controversy regarding the miraculous in religion—a controversy which for the moment looks as if it were to be won by those who deny it—one assumption is made by both sides. It is the assumption called the Law of the Uniformity of Nature. To the pre-scientific mind

there was no such law. Any effect might follow any cause. To the modern scientific mind it is a primary axiom that the same cause always produces the same effect. And as the modern religious mind is as scientific as any other, the axiom is accepted all round.

Mr. Charles A. Mercier, M.D., has written a book entitled *On Causation, with a Chapter on Belief* (Longmans). It is not a religious book, though it is not by any means to be called irreligious. It is written not in the interests of religion but of truth, and the author is not concerned to ask whether or not truth and religion coincide. What his opinions may be on any aspect of religion, such as the question of the miraculous, no one can tell. But one of the subjects which he discusses in the book is this Law of the Uniformity of Nature, and in the discussion of it he asks the question, *Does the same cause always produce the same effect?*

Dr. Mercier has already laid down the proposition that the cause is an action. So the question becomes, Does the same action always bring about the same result? 'Take the blow of a hammer, for instance: does the blow of a hammer produce the same effect whether it falls on the head of a nail, or the side of a bell, or a man's fingers, or a bale of wool, or a sheet of water? Clearly in this sense of the word "cause" the same cause does not always produce the same effect, and Nature is not uniform. But this definition of cause was provisional only. It was subsequently elaborated into this: that a cause is an action upon a thing; and the question now becomes, Does the same action on the same thing always produce the same effect? Again let us take the hammer and strike with it our sheet of water. The effect is a splash. Now let the same water be frozen, and let us strike it again. The same effect is not produced. It may be objected that the thing on which the cause acts is no longer the same thing, but it is quite arguable that it is the same thing. It is certain, however, that it is not for the purpose of the argument the same thing. Then in what respect does it differ? Liquidity and solidity are, for the purpose of the argument, passive states of the thing acted on by the cause, and according to the definition already given, a passive state of the thing acted on by the cause is a condition. It is evident, therefore, that the question we are discussing, Does the same cause always produce the same

effect? must be answered in the negative, unless we amend it by inserting a reference to the conditions; and the question ought to be put in the form: Does the same cause in the same conditions always produce the same effect? But this is an instance of the fallacy erroneously called the fallacy of many questions, which should be called, as it is called in my *New Logic*, the fallacy of the previous question. It implies that a previous question, which has not been answered, has been answered. It implies that the same action can take place for a second time upon the same thing in the same conditions; and this is not only impossible, but is acknowledged to be impossible by many of those who insist that the same cause always, or as they say invariably, produces the same effect.'

The passage is quoted not because it is clever but because it is clear. The whole book is just as clear and just as convincing as that paragraph.

To their 'Heart and Life' booklets Messrs. Allenson have added a Selection from the Letters of William Law, edited and arranged by M. M. Schofield. The title is *The Spirit is Life* (6d. net).

Some years ago a keen controversy rose and fell regarding the cruelty of beast to beast and bird to bird. The statement of certain scientific men left an uneasy impression of God's Providence. Mr. Charles F. Newall, after studying the whole subject carefully, has published a book on *The Problem of Pain in Nature* (Paisley: Gardner; 3s. 6d. net). His conclusion is that there is little pain and less cruelty. He supports it by argument and illustration, and writes a book which is not only readable but gives relief.

The Rev. Frank Inigo Harrison has published a volume of short devotional studies in St. Mark's Gospel. The title is *Come unto Me* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net).

A matter of very grave import is forcing itself upon our attention at the present time. It is the place which ought to be given to the Old Testament in determining our creed and conduct. It is the war that has brought it into prominence. For it is evident to not a few that the attitude of the Old Testament to war is not the attitude of the

New. This is one of the subjects, probably the most important subject, that is discussed by Dr. T. B. Strong, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, in his book on *The Place of Scripture in the Church in Ancient and Modern Times* (Longmans; 1s. net). Dr. Strong is a careful, conservative scholar; yet this little book raises questions about the Old Testament which we should like to see settled satisfactorily, and soon. If we could only recognize the fact of the progress of doctrine in the Old Testament!

Mr. A. H. Benton, late of the Indian Civil Service, has given much thought to the subject of education in India. The most urgent problem is that of instruction in ethics. The method of moral instruction apart from religion he considers condemned by its poor results. At the Allahabad Conference a Muhammadan member pronounced it a farce, and the Committee silently agreed. In any case, Mr. Benton appeals to history and to human life. Morality never has been and cannot be separated from religion.

But what are you to do in India where there are so many religions? Mr. Benton's method is bold enough. Teach the morality that belongs to each of the Indian religions to the children whose parents profess that religion—Hindu morality to Hindus, Muhammadan to Muhammadans, Christian to Christians.

To this suggestion the book leads up, through much interesting exposition of Indian life and educational experiment. Then this suggestion is worked out carefully and, as we have said, courageously. The book is called *Indian Moral Instruction and Caste Problems* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net).

Not prayer but intercessory prayer is the most pressing matter of the moment. It is most pressing theologically as well as practically. For all the difficulties of prayer concentrate in it. Intercessory prayer has been taken by itself and thought out thoroughly, thoroughly and devoutly and victoriously, by the Rev. David Jenks of the Society of the Sacred Mission. The result is a book entitled *A Study of Intercession* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), which takes a place of its own in the literature of prayer, and takes it by right of worth.

The Rev. Charles Courtenay, M.A., Chaplain of Holy Trinity, Rome, has written a book about

silence. *The Empire of Silence*, he calls it (Sampson Low; 6s. net). It is a book about saying nothing. Yet he takes more than four hundred pages in which to recommend it. For he has gone through all the available literature, English and other, and gathered examples and commendations. And he has divided all that he and his authors have to say about silence under appropriate headings, such as the Power of Silence, Grim Silence, Mystic Silence, Silent Men, Proverbial Silence, the Biblical Museum of Silence. It is an impressive gathering. There is no denying the impressiveness of it. There is no getting away from under it. It is not complete, of course. Mr. Courtenay is a man of wisdom and would not dream of making such a claim. He has missed, we think, that very striking confession of Dr. R. W. Dale which we are glad to see quoted in Professor Jackson's new anthology. Do you remember it? 'Soon after I became a minister,' says Dale, 'and while I was still a very young man, a great loss fell on a family in my congregation. The husband died a year or two after marriage. I went to see the widow. Her anguish was of that silent, self-restrained sort which is always most terrible to witness. There were no tears; there was no cry of complaint; not a word about the bright life which had been so suddenly darkened; not a word about the present agony or about the gloom and desolation of the years to come. Her grief was dumb. I was oppressed by it; I could say nothing. The sorrow seemed beyond the reach of comfort; and after sitting for a few minutes I rose in some agitation and went away without saying a word. After I had left the house, and when I had recovered self-possession, I felt humiliated and distressed that I had not spoken; I thought that perhaps it would have been better not to have gone at all. I do not feel so now. Sometimes the only consolation we can offer our friends is to let them know that we feel their sorrow is too great for any consolation of ours.'

Mr. Courtenay, we are sure, will be glad of that incident for a new edition. And so good is his book that we believe a new edition will be called for soon.

Principal Sir George Adam Smith has written an Introduction to a volume of sermons by the Rev. James Jack, B.D., which is published under the title of *A Great National Question* (Marshall

Brothers; 2s. 6d.). The question is Gideon's: 'If the Lord be with us, why then is all this befallen us?', and the reference is to the present war. Mr. Jack's answers are, first, because of our sins, especially drunkenness, indiscipline, love of pleasure, and the love of money. Also because of the sins of others, and especially because of the sins of the Prussians. Thus the first sermon gives the book its title. It also gives it its tone. The rest of the sermons are also concerned with the war. There is among them a short but useful exposition of the words of our Lord, 'Resist not evil.'

Does God answer prayer? Yes, directly, supernaturally, and unmistakably. It is the experience of a very large number of persons whose experiences have been gathered into a book by Mr. J. Kennedy Maclean. The title is *The Answer Came* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net).

'Christians have been very keen to believe the gospel about Jesus, but they have not been so eager to receive the gospel of Jesus. Even a superficial examination of Christian thought and dogma will make this plain. It is certainly most remarkable that only within the last century while democracy has really been in the making have men seriously begun to study the words and life of the Jesus of the Gospels. It is the ignorance of his words, or rather, the failure to build them into the constructive elements of our creeds and doctrines that accounts for so much of the reliance upon force which has passed itself off as Christian. We are not yet removed from that admiration of the Greek militaristic courage which so blazes forth in that most unlovely of masterpieces, Michael Angelo's Last Judgment. We have thought of Jesus as standing for his own rights, as driving out the cattle from the temple area, as casting a sword into the earth. It is true the proper interpretation of the Scriptural passages upon which this so-called virile Christianity has been built serves to question its final value. But men of "virility" are not eager to listen to those who would teach them that virility, if it be not touched by a willingness to give justice to others, may be easily turned into mere bellicosity.'

The passage occurs near the end of a carefully constructed argument in favour of *The Spiritual Interpretation of History* which moves steadily

through a book with that title written by Professor Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago (Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net). Professor Mathews is careful not to use theological language, or even, if he can help it, theological ideas. His appeal is to those who have had some scientific but no theological training. He does not even seek directly to lead to Christ. But he will not have history interpreted apart from the presence of God. And having the presence of God he cannot help having the ideal and the action of Jesus. And it is as the revealer of elemental spiritual laws that he introduces Jesus in the paragraph quoted. The whole book is temperate and convincing. The chapter on the distinction between rights and justice will come to some of its readers as a revelation.

Now that Mr. Murray has issued a new and thoroughly revised edition of Professor J. Arthur Thomson's book *The Study of Animal Life* (6s. net), we have the opportunity of recommending it for reading. For reading? Is it not written for study? It is. It is divided into four parts, to which the author himself gives the scientific titles of Physiology, Morphology, Embryology, and Ætiology. And it has been used as a class-book in most of the Colleges in the land. Yet it is a book for reading—written (probably because the author could not help it, so human is he in thought and in language) as if for no other purpose than to give pleasure. Moreover, it can be opened at any page. Suppose it were opened at page 67. The subject is attack and defence in the (lower) animals. There we have an illustration of a caterpillar which has assumed a terrifying attitude in the presence of an enemy, inevitably suggesting a soldier with his gas-mask on. And then, a few pages later, we are told that (like the British soldier again) 'in spite of all these "shifts," we must not imagine that animals are careful and troubled, for the very opposite is the case.'

'They do not sweat and whine about their condition,
They do not lie awake in the dark and weep for their
sins,
They do not make me sick discussing their duty to God.
Not one is dissatisfied, not one is demented
With the mania of owning things;
Not one kneels to another, nor to his kind that lived
thousands of years ago;
Not one is respectable or unhappy over the whole
earth.'

Dr. J. H. Jowett has written an Introduction to a remarkable volume of experience in home mission work. The author of the book is the late Mr. Edward Smith, J.P., who wrote the well-known volume *Mending Men*. In every case the power of the gospel of Christ was pitted against the power of the devil, with the drinking bar as his nearly invariable instrument. And in every case the gospel won. Mr. Smith tells his story with much simplicity and self-forgetfulness. The title is *Glowing Facts and Personalities* (R.T.S.; 1s. net).

To that most useful—for the greater number of students indispensable—series of books 'Translations of Early Documents' which Dr. Oesterley and Mr. Box are editing, two additions have been made—*The Book of Enoch* and *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net each). Both translations are from Canon R. H. Charles,

and both are enriched—greatly enriched—with Introductions by Dr. Oesterley.

When Judas said, 'Is it I?' what was his motive? Dr. A. H. McNeile says it was pure cynicism. 'It was a piece of cold-blooded cynicism; he took a mean advantage of the Lord's loving character, knowing that He would not expose him before the others. It was self-love, self-seeking, that brought him to it. The thorns sprang up, and choked all the good impulses that he had ever had.'

This is found in a volume of addresses of which the title is *Discipleship* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net). The idea of discipleship is one of the greatest, greater than that of apostleship, and Dr. McNeile claims all through the volume a life of sincere and selfless devotion from those who seek the office of the ministry.

The Psalter and the Present Distress.

BY THE REV. JOHN E. M'FADYEN, D.D., PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND THEOLOGY IN THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

Now let us look at some of the thoughts that shine forth from the Psalter upon the darkness of to-day.

THE PLACE OF SMALL NATIONS.

First, it suggests very powerfully *the place of small peoples in the purpose of God and in the education of humanity*. What is the Psalter? It is a small collection of one hundred and fifty poems, most of them very brief, which came from the tiny land of a small people. We have no need to deprecate the great empires of the ancient or the modern world: they have all their place in the purpose of God, they have all their contribution to make to history and to humanity. But it is a simple historical fact that it is to the smallest peoples that the debt of the world is deepest. It would hardly be too much to say that the world owes more to Greece and to Palestine—to Greece with her deathless poetry, art, and philosophy, and to Palestine with her religion—than to all the other countries of the world put together. They are still to-day the inspiration, as they are the source, of those things by which the world lives.

One of the Psalmists claimed that Jehovah had chosen Zion and desired it for His habitation (132¹³), and the infinite debt of the world to the Psalter is the proof that the claim is a just one. It is from Zion that the river of song broke forth which has made glad the weary of all the ages.

Now who are these, we ask, and whence came they—these whose words have been the comfort and the inspiration of the centuries, these whose songs have cheered so many a night of weeping and helped men to wait with patience and with hope for the joy that was to come in the morning? It is the simple truth that 'their voice has gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world.' Who are these, and whence came they? They came from one of the smallest of lands, from a land not more than 150 miles from north to south, and between 40 and 50 from east to west—a country about the size of Wales; or if we believe, as we may, that much, if not most, of the Psalter comes from post-exilic times, and therefore from Judah, then the soil from which it sprang was far more diminutive still—only a few square miles. It would seem to be to the

weak and the small things of this world that God has given His greatest work to do. Size is not the measure of a nation's greatness any more than of a poem's: it might even be said that in the Psalter the greatest poems are the shortest, such as the twenty-third, the one hundred and twenty-sixth, and, generally, the beautiful group which we know as the Pilgrim Psalms (120-134). It is very striking and worth laying to heart to-day that the profoundest service to the world has been rendered by one of the smallest of all peoples.

FAITH IN THE MORAL ORDER.

The next feature of the Psalter which we may consider as well fitted to steady and strengthen us in the chaos of to-day is *its overwhelming faith in the moral order of the world*. This, of course, it shares with the Old Testament as a whole: the prophets and the historians believe with all their soul that history is no haphazard thing, that God has built His world upon moral foundations, that He has not left it to itself, but that He sits upon the throne as Lord of history. But in the Psalms this great faith in the indestructibility of the moral order and the invincibility of the divine purpose shines forth with peculiar splendour, and all the more winsomely from its frequent pictorial setting. There were men in the Psalmists' time, as in our own, who were afraid for the foundations. They saw with sorrow that 'the wicked were bending their bow, to shoot in the dark at the upright,' and they asked with trepidation, 'When the foundations are being destroyed, what can the just man do?' But the Psalmist had his answer ready:

The Lord in His holy temple,
The Lord in heaven is enthroned.
His eyes behold the world,
They narrowly scan all men.
The Lord scans righteous and wicked,
And the lover of wrong He hates.
On the wicked He rains coals of fire and brimstone,
And scorching wind is their portion allotted.
For the Lord is just, and justice He loves;
So the upright shall see His face (114-7).

The Psalmist has no doubt about that. He believes that the foundations of the world are well and deeply laid, and that there need be no fear of their ultimate destruction. Those men knew that 'clouds and darkness are round about Him,' but they knew as well that 'justice and right are the base of His throne' (97²). He might seem to stand afar off and to give no heed to the cries of the faithful who were losing and suffering all for

His dear sake. These were times when their misery constrained them to cry:

Why dost Thou hide Thy face
Forgetting our stress and our misery? (44²⁴).

But they always came back in the end to their faith in His justice, in His pity, in His care for the men and the nations that are crushed. They return to the certainty that in His time, if not in theirs, He will defeat the purpose of the arrogant and vindicate those whom they have wronged. As in the twelfth Psalm:

'The poor are despoiled, and the needy are sighing;
So now I will rouse me'—the Lord declareth—
'And set him in safety at whom they snort' (v.⁶).

The only God whom the Jew could worship was a God to whom moral distinctions were real, and in a world governed by such a God it simply could not be that the ultimate victory would rest with the forces of evil; for this would mean that God was not Lord of the world which His own fingers had framed, that His will was not the supreme will in the universe. But

He hath done whatever He pleased,
In the seas and in all the abysses (135⁶)

—and not least in the abysses of history. The men or the nations who defy His moral will have the universe against them, and their doom is sealed and certain. This faith is strikingly put in the figure of the Cup of the Divine Wrath:

In the hand of the Lord is a cup—
Foaming wine, richly mixed with spices.
Out of this He poureth a draught,
And all the wicked on earth
Must drain it down to the dregs (75⁸).

The writers of the Psalter have noted with satisfaction the nemesis that runs through human affairs. It is a favourite thought of the Old Testament that the unrepentant sinner is not only doomed, but is hurled to the very doom which he had planned for his victims. Jacob had hoped to succeed by craft, and by a deeper craft he is foiled. With whatsoever measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you again; and so in the Psalter:

The wicked have drawn the sword,
To slay men who walk uprightly;
But their sword shall pierce their own hearts,
And their bows shall be broken in pieces (37²⁴).

Over and over again we find in the Psalter the statement of this great fact of human experience—a fact which is confirmed by the history that is being made to-day; a fact, too, which, from the frequent statements of it in the Psalter, seems to have furnished to those ancient singers particularly

welcome proof that the moral fortunes of the world were in safe and mighty hands :

They set a net for my feet,
But in it was their own foot caught (57⁶).

On his own head his mischief comes back
On his own crown his violence descends (71⁶).

The faith of ancient Israel was that God would deal with men and nations according to their works ; that the nations which live in forgetfulness of God and the claims of humanity would lose their place and power, while 'the righteous,' as one Psalmist puts it, 'would come to their rights' (94¹⁶). And the remarkable thing is that they persisted in believing this, though their own national fortunes were for the most part so stern and sore.

So far, of course, as the individual was concerned, they saw, as they could not fail to see, that goodness was no guarantee of prosperity, that fidelity, in certain conditions of society, might lead to danger and hardship and death ; and to the cause of true religion there was a real gain in this, as it threw the faithful back upon their God, until they learned to find their sweetest satisfaction in Him for this life, and also—in one or two Psalms—for that which is to come (49¹⁵ 73²⁴). But while this is true of the individual, the Jew of the Old Testament persisted in believing that, in the international world, the prizes would go in the long run to those who by their morality deserved them. In the great conflict waged between the Lord and His people on the one hand, and the forces of evil, represented by the heathen, on the other, it must not and could not be that the Lord would be defeated.

The Lord frustrates the designs of the heathen ;

What the nations have purposed, He bringeth to nought.
But the Lord's own design shall stand for ever,
And what His heart hath purposed, through all generations (33¹⁰).

There were times when it was plain to the duller eye that the Lord had triumphed gloriously—times when (at least in the fancy of the Hebrew poet) the very heathen had been constrained to say, as they looked upon the fortunes of Israel, 'The Lord hath dealt greatly with them' (126²). But when this faith in the visible supremacy of moral forces was not able to support itself upon contemporary fact, it did not cease to be sure of itself, nor did it permit itself to be crushed : it simply reached out boldly into the future and found there the consummation and the triumph

which it could not find here. Like the brave men they were, those old Hebrews kept their faith when their world was falling to pieces. They refused to be crushed by the miseries and the horrors and the tragedies of the present, and they persisted in creating their splendid pictures of the better days to come.

And this is what we essentially mean by what we call the eschatology of the Psalter, and indeed of the Bible generally. It is simply 'the extension of the faith in a living God to the final outcome of history.' It was their way of saying that God was not to be baffled, that what He had begun He would assuredly continue and complete. So, when looking round with sorrow upon the world as they knew it, with its manifold disappointments and with the seeming defeat of the hopes they had been taught to cherish : when He for whom they longed seemed to stand afar off : they said to their own hearts and to one another, 'He is coming,' 'He will come.'

He cometh to judge the earth.
He will judge the world with justice
And the nations with faithfulness (96¹³).

And this judgment to which they look forward not only makes their own hearts glad ; it is a thing to set the whole universe ringing with joy :

Let the heavens be glad and the earth rejoice,
Let the sea and its fulness thunder.
Let the field, and all that is in it, exult :
Let the trees of the forest ring out their joy (96¹¹).
Let the streams clap their hands,
Let the hills shout for gladness together
Before the Lord—for He cometh (98⁷).

They walk by faith, not by sight : and what they see with the clear eye of faith is a sight to cheer and exhilarate the most despondent ; for it was nothing less than a world steady at last after all the tempest, a God whose purpose had triumphed, and a faithful people who could lift their song of praise, 'Now we are glad because it is quiet, for He has brought us to our desired haven.' No lyric expresses this mood of ultimate triumph more gloriously than the ninety-third Psalm :

Jehovah hath taken His seat on the throne,
Clothed with majesty, girt with might.
Now the world stands firm, to be shaken no more ;
Firm standeth Thy throne from all eternity.
Thou art from everlasting.

The floods, O Jehovah, have lifted,
The floods have lifted their voice,
The floods lift up their roar.
But more grand than the great roaring waters,
More grand than the breakers of ocean,
Grand on the height stands Jehovah.

The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel.

By EDWARD GRUBB, M.A., FORMERLY EDITOR OF *THE BRITISH FRIEND*.

MUCH attention has been directed of late to the Eschatology of the Synoptic Gospels, but considerably less, so far as I can discover, to that of the Fourth.¹ This appears to me a matter for regret; for it is conceivable that the latter may afford important help for interpreting the former. This may be so none the less if the Fourth Gospel be in the main a doctrinal rather than a strictly historical treatise. To prevent misconception, I may say that to me it appears to be an idealized picture of Jesus as the Incarnate Logos, worked out on a basis of historic facts, and intended to bring out what the author believed to be their inner and spiritual significance. My purpose is to call attention to what this writer, representing the most enlightened section of Christian thought at the close of the first century, made of the Apocalyptic teaching; in the hope that it may incite some scholars, who are far better equipped than I am, to do the work more thoroughly.

It is sometimes said that from the Fourth Gospel, apart from two passages which are hardly in line with its main ideas (Jn 5^{28, 29} 21^{22, 23}), the Apocalyptic and Eschatological element disappears. It would be truer, I think, to say that it is *transformed* by fusion with the great conceptions of the writer: that Jesus is the manifestation in time of the eternal Divine Logos, who has come from the Father to bring Life to men, and whose return to the Father yet leaves Him with them in spiritual presence as that Life. Broadly speaking, in this Gospel the inward and spiritual replaces the outward and spectacular. Eschatology is transfigured, and its terms revalued. The Kingdom of God becomes a condition of the soul, which a man must 'enter' by being 'born of the Spirit' (3⁵). It is identified with the 'eternal life' which is made possible for men by the 'lifting up' of the Son of man (3¹⁴).²

¹ There is a valuable chapter on 'The Johannine Interpretation' in Dr. E. W. Winstanley's book, *Jesus and the Future*, to which I am indebted for some of the thoughts that follow, but I do not remember to have met with anything else on the subject in English. My knowledge of German is small.

² The identification of the Kingdom of God with eternal life also appears in the Synoptics (cf. Mk 10¹⁷ with 10²³). Dr. E. F. Scott shows that it had also been made by some of the Apocalyptic writers (*The Kingdom and the Messiah*, p. 27).

The conception of the 'Son of man' in this Gospel has affinities with that in Enoch, where He pre-exists with the 'Head of Days,' who has 'chosen' Him and 'committed unto him the sum of judgment' (cf. Jn 5²⁷); but it differs in that He has become truly man, and can perfect His 'glory' only through obedience and suffering. That the phrase is used with a Messianic meaning is clear from 1⁵¹, which is perhaps the most definitely Apocalyptic passage in the Fourth Gospel: 'Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of man.' The author does not (like Philo) divorce his Logos doctrine from Jewish Messianic conceptions: he retains but transcends them; he makes the recognition of Jesus as Messiah a stage towards belief in Him as Logos or Son of God. Jesus declares Himself to be the Messiah (e.g. in 4²⁶), and is hailed by Nathanael and by the multitude as the 'King of Israel' (1⁴⁹ 12¹³). But His 'Kingdom' is 'not of this world'; its essence is 'the truth'—the bringing of the mind and will of man into conformity with the mind of God (18³⁶⁻³⁸). The thought of the Kingdom as *future* is preserved in the many passages where Jesus declares, or the author remarks, that His 'hour' is not yet come, or is just at hand (2⁴ 7^{6, 30} 8²⁰ 17¹); but that it is also *present* is indicated by the double use of the saying, 'The hour cometh, and now is': first, when 'the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth' (4²³); and second, when 'the [spiritually] dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live' (5²⁵). The two thoughts are beautifully blended in the simile of the fields 'white already unto the harvest,' in which the disciples shall reap the fruit of which their Master has sown the seed (4³⁵⁻³⁸).

The transformation of Synoptic ideas which results from their being taken up into the great conceptions of the Fourth Evangelist may be brought out by a brief study of his use of the two terms 'Judgment' and 'Glory.'

The word 'Judgment' in this Gospel rarely carries with it the thought of a mighty event in the future; usually it is an ever-present (and therefore eternal) function of the Logos as such. The Logos is the 'light' of men; and as light reveals the

contrast between black and white, which darkness obscures, so the Light of God is always separating good from evil, drawing to itself the good and repelling the evil (3¹⁹⁻²¹). Most of all is this the case when the Light shines forth in a personal and sinless Character; hence the very presence of Jesus in the world is itself the judgment, the separation (3¹⁸ 5²⁵). He judges 'righteously,' because He perfectly expresses, not His own will, but the mind and will of God (5³⁰).

There is, on the surface at least, a good deal of contradiction in the expressions used in regard to Judgment. In 5²² it is said that God as Father judges no man, but has given all judgment to the Son; yet in 5⁴⁵ God is the Judge before whom men are accused; and in 8¹⁵ Jesus declares that He judges no man. This assertion is repeated in 12^{47, 48}, where it is implied that Judgment is (so to say) not a personal decision but an automatic process, wrought out by the chances a man has had and rejected. Nevertheless, the Apocalyptic conception of a 'Judgment Day,' when the righteous should be vindicated and their enemies finally overthrown, is retained, not only in Martha's reference to the 'resurrection at the last day' (11²⁴), but in many sayings attributed to Jesus Himself, where the same expression 'the last day' is used (6^{39, 40, 44, 54} 12⁴⁸). This expression does not agree very well with the thought of Judgment as a present and eternal fact. I am not prepared to suggest with confidence any theory that will resolve these apparent contradictions. Possibly different strains of thought were present in the mind of the author (or in the minds of the authors) of the Gospel, and were imperfectly fused.¹

But this seems clear: the teaching about Judgment is (on the whole) far more deep and spiritual than that which we find in the Synoptics. It is

¹ It has often been pointed out that some of the comments on sayings of Jesus made by the author, or by someone concerned in the composition of the Fourth Gospel, show a lack of insight, e.g. the explanation of 'Destroy this temple' in 2²¹, and of 'lifting up' in 12³⁸. It is in this way that I should be inclined to explain the apparently crude eschatology of 5^{28, 29}, where there is no suggestion (as there is in 5²⁵) that 'all that are in the tombs' means the *spiritually* dead, or that the judgment is present and not only to come. There are, it is true, grave difficulties in working out any theory of composite authorship; but it seems clear that the final author has retained a few expressions which are at a lower level of spiritual insight than his own—perhaps because he had received them from one who was known as a companion of Jesus, and whose authority therefore carried weight.

presented (at times) as a present and perennial experience, as something inherent in the very fact that new moral truth is revealed, and as irrevocably bound up with the way a man uses the revelation that (if he will surrender himself to it) may be his:

Thou judgest us; Thy purity
Does all our lusts condemn;
The love that draws us nearer Thee
Is hot with wrath to them.

Further, Judgment is not presented as the ultimate Divine purpose. Jesus has come, not for the judgment of the world (the final overthrow of the wicked, which was regarded as the Messiah's main work), but for its salvation (3¹⁷ 12^{47b}). Yet this salvation is no soft or easy task; it can only be wrought out through a mighty conflict with the powers of evil—a victorious conflict, which itself is judgment. 'Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out' (12³¹; cf. 16¹¹). The 'world' is not to be destroyed, but 'overcome' (16³³).

The 'Glory' passages are even more pregnant with freshness of meaning. The glory of the Son of Man is not merely something He is about to win when manifested as the Messiah; it is something He has temporarily abandoned by 'descending out of heaven,' but which He is to regain (3¹³ 6⁶² 17^{5, 24}). Yet even in His humiliation the 'glory' was not absent; it was manifested not alone in His miraculous 'signs' (2¹¹ 11^{4, 40}), but in the 'grace and truth' that shone in His earthly career (1¹⁴). It is not an exaltation or an honour that He seeks to gain for Himself (8^{50, 54} 5⁴¹); it is the manifestation through Him of the glory, the 'name,' the character, of His Father (7¹⁸ 12²⁸ 17^{5, 6}). And this manifestation He can give only by stooping to the lowest depth (as the world would say) of humiliation, in utter obedience to God, and self-abandoning love to men. He glorifies His Father on the earth, by accomplishing the work that has been given Him to do (17⁴). It was when 'his hour was come that he should depart unto the Father,' when He 'knew that the Father had given all things into his hands,' that He showed His love 'unto the end' by washing the disciples' feet (13¹⁻⁵). His 'glory,' therefore, is the precise opposite of what the world counts as glory. It is to be found in the entire refusal of all self-seeking, in perfect self-consecration to the will of God and the service of men, even unto death (17¹⁹). It is just when He sees His death for men close before

Him that He speaks most constantly of 'glory.' When some Greeks come asking to see Him, He says, 'The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified'; and goes on at once to speak of His imminent death, of the 'trouble' of His soul, and to pray for deliverance from the terrible 'hour' that is upon Him, which yet He knows He has been sent to face (12²⁰⁻²⁷). It is when Judas has gone out to betray Him that Jesus says, 'Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him' (13³¹). The 'glory' of Jesus is the same as His 'lifting up' (3¹⁴ 8²⁸ 12³²)—the exaltation and victory that comes through humiliation and death for men.¹

But further: He, as others are brought to share it, can only win His real glory: 'I am glorified *in them*' (17¹⁰): the Spirit of Truth is to glorify Him by taking His secret and declaring it to His followers (16¹⁴). It is only as they come to share His consecration that Jesus Himself can attain His glory.

The real glory of Jesus, then, is the manifestation in Him of the Divine character. His glory is God's glory; His nature is God's nature; His self-abandoning love is God's love; His enriching life is God's life. This is what He has come to impart to men, that they may have God's outflowing love and life reproduced in them, and so may be bound in mystic union to Him and to one another. 'The glory which thou hast given me I have given them; *that they all may be one, even as we are one*' (17^{22, 26}).

The coming of Christ by His living Spirit into the hearts of His true followers altogether replaces in the Fourth Gospel the crude millennial splendours of the Synoptics. It is into this that the Parousia has been transformed. Except for one passage in the Appendix (21²²), there is no allusion to a 'coming' or return of Christ except as the Spirit of Truth, the Comforter. This is the more remarkable inasmuch as we know well that the main body of the Christian Church during the early centuries continued to hold the millennial conceptions with

which the disciples started out. The depth and power of the Johannine teaching would seem to have been imperfectly appreciated.

How far does the teaching of this Gospel faithfully present to us the underlying thoughts of Jesus Himself—or was it an improvement on His meaning, due to the non-fulfilment of His forecasts of 'coming on the clouds of heaven'? Even if the familiar terms of Apocalyptic imagery were those that He actually employed, it would be quite consistent with His methods of teaching if He used them in a deeper sense than His hearers for the most part understood; and it should not surprise us if they have in part reproduced the form without indicating the true meaning that lay behind it. 'Jesus over the heads of His reporters' was one of Matthew Arnold's canons of Gospel criticism; and it appears to be a sounder one than the assumption that any of His interpreters were more spiritually-minded than their Master. If St. Paul discovered that 'the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' (Ro 14¹⁷), is it extravagant to suppose that it meant something at least as ethical and spiritual in the mind of Jesus Himself?

There are indications scattered in the Synoptics that the earlier evangelists reported sayings whose depth they had not fully fathomed. Notably this is so in Luke, who reports the sayings that 'the kingdom of God cometh not with observation . . . for lo, the kingdom of God is in the midst of you,' and that 'the days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the *days* of the Son of man and shall not see it' (Lk 17²⁰⁻²²). This suggests that it will not be a spectacular event *in time*; and the suggestion is confirmed by the use of the word 'henceforth' (ἀπ' ἄρτι, Mt 26⁶⁴; ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, Lk 22⁶⁹) in the words of Jesus before the High Priest: 'Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven.' Further, both Matthew and Luke record (in slightly different words) the saying that 'as the lightning cometh forth from the east, and is seen even unto the west, so shall be the coming of the Son of man' (Mt 24²⁷, Lk 17²⁴)—indicating that the Parousia will not be an event *in space*, any more than an event *in time*.

If, as the fourth Evangelist suggests, the root thought in the mind of Jesus, when He spoke of His 'coming,' was His victory over the 'power of darkness' (Lk 22⁵³), to be achieved through His

¹ The comments of the author (apart from 12³⁸) make it clear that so he himself understood the words he attributes to Jesus. The disciples did not understand His entry into Jerusalem till after He was 'glorified' (12¹⁶). 'The Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified' (7³⁹): He could not come to them in fullness of spiritual presence until He had first departed from them in the body (cf. 16⁷). Peter, in the Appendix, is to 'glorify God' by faithfulness unto death (21¹⁹).

death and resurrection, this would afford a simple and natural explanation of one at least of the most difficult passages in the Synoptics: 'Verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come' (Mt 10²³). That this 'coming' refers primarily to His death I cannot doubt, though He may not at that time have foreseen the circumstances in which it would occur. If His thoughts were already centred in His coming death, but He felt it impossible to speak of this 'openly' (Mk 8³²) till He had won from the disciples such an understanding confession as that of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi, what more likely than that He should have hinted at it in veiled language of this character?¹

I suggest that we can trust the Johannine interpretation, as giving a real clue to what lay behind

¹ So also I should venture to explain the similar statement in the parallels Mk 9¹, Mt 16²⁸, Lk 9²⁷.

the imagery in which Jesus clothed His thoughts of the glory He was to win through death, of the victory He was to achieve by perfect obedience, though that should lead Him through depths of shame. If so, then the Apocalyptic sayings take their place as no excrescence, no mistake of a deluded enthusiast, but as the crown of all His teaching. They give us the assurance—which in these days of darkness and horror we need as much as the disciples needed it—that His Kingdom will come in glory and power, that He will yet be the Lord of all our life, if only He can find once more the men and women in whom He can be 'glorified,' who will strive for His Kingdom even when the cause seems hopeless, will believe in Him even when 'the world' seems to have conquered, and be willing to follow Him even unto death. 'If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be.'

In the Study.

The Seven Words.

VII.

The Surrendered Life.

'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'—Lk 23⁴⁶.

THE darkness had lasted from noon till three o'clock, and it was after this that Jesus took the vinegar, and cried with a loud voice, and died.

The evening was closing in. The mysterious darkness had passed away, the sun again shone over Calvary and the mountains of Judæa and the Holy City. The sun was drawing to its setting, and its level rays gilded the cross, and cast a long shadow eastward over those who stood behind. The darkness was perhaps rolling eastward, and so the cross would stand out brilliantly against the purple bank of gloom behind. The day—this dreadful day—was drawing to an end, and soon the Sabbath would have begun. Already the crowds were leaving the hill and turning back to Jerusalem, and the scribes and Pharisees had left, for the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice in the temple approached.

Then Jesus 'cried with a loud voice, and said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.'

It is the last of the Seven Words, and it is a word of rest and trust. The conflict is past, the darkness is past, the suffering is past. All is finished. There is no reason why our Lord should remain longer on the cross. So He commits His soul to His Heavenly Father's keeping, and bows His head, and gives up the ghost.

1. What was the cry that preceded these words? Was it a cry of relief at the touch of death? Was it a cry of victory? Was it a cry of gladness that He had endured to the end? Or did the Father look out upon Him in answer to His *My God*, and the blessedness of it make Him cry aloud because He could not smile? Was such His condition now that the greatest gladness of the universe could express itself only in a loud cry? Or was it but the last wrench of pain ere the final repose began? It may have been all in one. But never surely in all books, in all words of thinking men, can there be so much expressed as lay unarticulated in that cry of the Son of God.

2. The words that He spoke are a quotation from the 31st Psalm, as the Fourth Word from the cross is a quotation from the 22nd. A suggestion not to be forgotten lies in the fact that our dying Redeemer thus drew on the Psalms for comfort in those last hours of life. We may securely argue

from dying words to living habits: it was because He had been accustomed to nourish His devotional life by the religious use of the Psalms that, when He came to die, He thus fell back on them for strength. And the same must be said of the attitude of the spirit towards God. What it was in death, that it had been in life. No trait of Christ's character is more original and none more winning than the loving simplicity of His habitual attitude towards His Father; and here, on the cross, that attitude is still apparent. The first and the last words from the cross are addressed to the Father: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'; 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' In the interval between those words our Redeemer had passed under a dark cloud of desolation; He had lost for the moment the sense of the Father's love, and had lifted His voice in protest, sinless yet infinitely woeful, to an unregarding Heaven: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' But it was only for a moment; underneath Him still in that horrible darkness were the Everlasting Arms, and, as His last vigour failed Him, it was into them that He fell to rest.

3. In the psalm the prayer has reference to life; it is the committal of the spirit in the midst of tumult and danger to the merciful and faithful keeping of One able to protect and deliver. On the cross, in the midst of darkness and anguish, it is used as the expression of life's last act of renunciation—the surrender of the departing spirit to God. It is not a cry, like the Psalmist's, to be preserved from death, but a cry to be preserved through death unto everlasting life.

And if we are to be able to use such a prayer in death, it must be familiar to us in life. Hardly may we learn to pray it on the bed of death if we have not been accustomed to such thoughts in the heyday of strength. It is surely a remarkable thing that the two personal cries to God which our Lord uttered from the cross were, both of them, petitions already consecrated by the devotion of many centuries. They are not new prayers, fashioned for the crisis of the moment—they are old prayers; and in prayer, as in doctrine, it is *the old which is good*.

¶ These words, which now He uses, were, according to some, the daily prayer which every Jewish mother taught her child to say, the last thing when lying down at night. If this was so, the Lord's last words may have been the

prayer which, when a little child, His Blessed Virgin Mother had taught Him, as an evening act of devotion, a child's short evensong of calm and trustful repose of soul. How this reminds us of those words, in His ministry, in which He speaks of that which is truly childlike as being most god-like, 'the same is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven.'¹

I. THE PRAYER.

1. *Father*.—In quoting the prayer of the Hebrew poet, Jesus has made a notable addition to its terminology. He has prefaced it with the word 'Father,' which is the name by which He has taught us to speak to God in prayer. And this word, which from Jesus we have learnt to use, states the very kernel of the Christian hope.

The advance which this name indicates over the earlier names of the Old Testament is plain enough. It changed, deepened, and enriched men's thoughts of God. He was seen to be all that men had hitherto believed concerning Him, and wonderfully more also. It was a great thing to realize God as eternal, but to realize Him as paternal—what a new and blessed thought! This name contains the special revelation which Jesus made of God. It has already wrought revolutions, and will go on changing both the thought and the life of man.

¶ 'Father.' This is pre-eminently the word of Jesus; His one name for God, the one note to which all His music was attuned, the central persuasion and confidence of His soul, the key to His life, the first and the last in His teaching, the soul of His religion, the symbol of His whole theology. It is the one recorded word of His youth: 'Wist ye not I must be about my Father's business?' It was the word from heaven heard in His heart at the opening of His public career—a crisis marked by a new disclosure and realization of His Sonship to God. It was the first word of the prayer He taught His disciples; the word with which He accepted the inevitable in Gethsemane; the first word from the cross, and the last before 'the deep, vast speechlessness of death.' It was the ruling passion of His life—the passion which had moved Him to intense and tireless toil and sacrifice, and sustained Him amidst the temptations of manhood—which strengthened Him in the hour of His final conflict and calmed Him with its most tranquil assurance. It was 'Father' at the beginning; 'Father' all through the stormy years that led to the cross; 'Father' when He felt His hour was come, and troubled in spirit He cried, 'What shall I say?'; and it was 'Father' at the end. 'I live,' He once said, 'by the Father,' and so He died trusting in the Father. The commending of His spirit at the last moment to His Father was but the summing up of what He had been doing all His life. He breathed out the whole

¹ S. J. Stone, *Parochial Sermons*, 225.

spirit of His life in that prayer. All His days He had been offering Himself to His Father to enjoy and to suffer, to do and to bear; and so in death, and beyond death, He gives Himself into the hands of His Father.¹

2. *Into Thy hands.*—By 'the hand' of God we mean His working power. Using the term plurally, and at the same time lovingly, by 'the hands' we mean more than this. Power, indeed, is meant, but power working by love; power in its delicacy; power soft, caressing, fondly tender; power taking up trusting weakness; the power that lovingly catches, lovingly holds, lovingly hushes, lovingly leads. The image, though sublime, is domestic. It is the utterance of a child's conception of God. When David said, 'Into thy hands I commit my spirit,' he seems to have had in his thought hands held out to an infant, to catch it, to clasp it, and to make it happy, when it springs forward.

¶ Let our hearts rest where the heart of Jesus rested. No fearful adventure, no leap in the dark, can death be to those who live and die in His faith. It was said of Him that He was delivered into the hands of men to be crucified, but beneath the hands of His foes were His Father's hands. So when we fall, it is not into the hands of disease, decay, and destruction, but into the hands of the living and Eternal Father, who will keep that which in life's last moment of renunciation we commit to Him.²

3. *I commend my spirit.*—The last thought of Jesus was not about His body, but His 'spirit.' His body had suffered almost more than He could bear; the vital forces were nearly spent, the cross had done its deadly work, the moment had come for dissolution—the body going one way, the spirit another.

What is the spirit? It is the finest, highest, sacredest part of our being. In modern and ordinary language we call it the soul, when we speak of man as composed of body and soul; but in the language of Scripture it is distinguished even from the soul as the most lofty and exquisite part of the inner man. It is to the rest of our nature what the flower is to the plant or what the pearl is to the shell. It is that within us which is specially allied to God and eternity. It is also, however, that which sin seeks to corrupt and our spiritual enemies seek to destroy. No doubt these are specially active in the article of death; it is their last chance; and fain would they seize the spirit as it parts from the body and, dragging it

down, rob it of its destiny. Jesus knew that He was launching out into eternity; and, plucking His spirit away from these hostile hands which were eager to seize it, He placed it in the hands of God. There it was safe.

II. CHRIST'S VIEW OF DEATH.

This last word of the expiring Saviour revealed His view of death.

The word used by Jesus in commending His spirit to God implies that He was giving it away in the hope of finding it again. He was making a deposit in a safe place, to which, after the crisis of death was over, He would come and recover it. Who can doubt that we, who must all enter upon the solemn mystery of death, were intended to draw comfort and brightness from this view of death given us by the dying Lord? The spirit and body came to be called 'my deposit,' 'that which I have committed unto him,' from a sweet and solemn reminiscence of the last sentence upon the cross. The deposit must be safe which is lodged with such a depository, and vested with such a trustee. Blessed is he who can call God his Father with his latest breath, and imitate Christ, if not in the magnificence of the investment, yet with some faint degree of the filial confidence with which it is lodged.

Are any of us afraid of death? If we are, then with the eye of faith see what a good death is. There is no fear in it—there is no terror in it—there is simple, calm trust in it. There is nothing in itself to fear in the spirit passing to the Father of spirits. If the life has been what it ought to be—if the life is the Three Hours' life—if there is a forgiving spirit—if there is contrition and courage as in the penitent thief—if the home life is loving and considerate—if there is patience through the darkness—if there is helpfulness to others' wants, as humanity thirsts—if it is a sacramental life in communion with the perfected life of Jesus Christ—then we need not be afraid to die.

¶ Deaths have been as varied as lives; but generally men have died as they have lived, and so the final utterances of men have been very different. The last words of Hobbes, the sceptical philosopher, were: 'I am going to take a leap in the dark. I commit my body to the worms and my spirit to the great Perhaps.' 'Let the curtain down,' muttered the dying Rabelais; 'the farce is played out.' The last words of Rousseau were: 'Being of beings, God.' The historic burden of Cardinal Wolsey's last utterance was: 'Had I but served my God as diligently as I have served the

¹ J. Hunter, *De Profundis Clamavi*, 150.

² *Ib.* 167.

king, He would not have given me up in my grey hairs.' Addison said, with great difficulty, on his death-bed, to a youth for whom he had sent: 'See in what peace a Christian can die,' and soon expired. Locke, the father of English philosophy, said the day before his death: 'I have lived enough, and thank God for having spent my life so happily.' As Martin Luther lay on his death-bed, his friend Dr. Jonas asked him: 'Reverend father, do you die with a firm conviction of the faith you have taught?' Luther, in a distant voice, replied 'Yes,' and soon after breathed his last. The executioner of Sir Walter Raleigh told him that his head was somewhat awry on the block. 'So the heart be right,' said Sir Walter, 'no matter which way the head lies.' General Wolfe, when his men were victorious before Quebec, dies saying: 'Now, God be praised, I will die in peace.' Goethe, that giant mind of Germany, dies asking for 'more light, more light'; and Schiller, asked how he found himself, answered: 'More and more calm.' The last words of Beethoven, who was deaf, were: 'I shall hear in heaven.' John Wesley dies saying: 'Best of all, God is with us.' 'I feel,' said Cardinal Wiseman, a short time before he died, 'like a schoolboy who has learnt his lesson, and is now going home for his holidays.' Dr. Watts, when asked on his death-bed how he was, answered: 'Waiting God's leave to die.' And one of the last recorded observations which Browning, ever firm in his faith in the future life, made to a friend was: 'Never say of me that I am dead.'¹

III. HIS SURRENDER TO THE FATHER.

Jesus' death was a willing surrender of life. Though His death was violent and cruel, it was a voluntary sacrifice; and His surrender to the Father was a free, spontaneous act. In full possession of His powers, Christ committed Himself to God. None took His life from Him. He laid it down of Himself. 'My life,' He said, 'no man taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down.'

¶ The surrendered life is the life of a child of God—childlike, meek, lowly, full of faith and trust, of repentance, of love, fearing to offend our Father, pure as in His sight, obedient, doing such things as please Him, always desiring to serve Him. For is not lowliness of spirit humility, which is the foundation stone of the Christ-like life, the childlike spirit, whose only thought is to please the Father and do His will. He became obedient unto death. He submitted Himself, He pleased not Himself, He commended His soul to His Father when His will was done.

Let us ask God to give us this same childlike spirit, that we may follow in His steps.

And this is the end of such a life, the reward of the child of God—to go back to the Father's hands, to be welcomed home, and find rest.²

LITERATURE.

- Alexander, W., *Verbum Crucis* (1893), 103.
 Baring-Gould, S., *The Seven Last Words* (1884), 83.
 Bernard, J. H., *Verba Crucis* (1915), 62.
 Brent, C. H., *The Consolations of the Cross* (1904), 69.
 Burn, A. E., *The Crown of Thorns* (1911), 149.
 Davies, J. A., *Seven Words of Love* (1895), 67.
 Dixon, H. T., *The Power of the Cross* (1911), 55.
 Gay, J., *The Seven Sayings from the Cross* (1901), 100.
 Gough, E. J., *The Religion of the Son of Man* (1894), 136.
 Hancock, B. M., *Free Bondmen* (1913), 37.
 Henson, H. H., *The Value of the Bible* (1904), 278.
 Hodges, G., *The Cross and Passion* (1915), 71.
 Hunter, J., *De Profundis Clamavi* (1908), 148.
 Hutchieson, F. L., *The Great Oblation*, 101.
 Ingram, A. F. W., *Addresses in Holy Week* (1902), 93.
 Jerdan, C., *For the Lord's Table* (1899), 236.
 Knight, H. T., *The Cross, the Font, and the Altar* (1911), 77.
 Longhurst, T. J., *The Royal Master* (1905), 99.
 Lowrie, W., *Gaudium Crucis* (1905), 99.
 MacDonald, G., *Unspoken Sermons*, i. (1890), 180.
 Mortimer, A. G., *Jesus and the Resurrection* (1898), 66.
 Newman, W., *Meditations on the Seven Last Words* (1893), 84.
 Simpson, J. G., *Christus Crucifixus* (1909), 295.
 Stalker, J., *The Trial and Death of Jesus Christ* (1894), 254.
 Stanford, C., *Voices from Calvary* (1893), 173.
 Stanton, A. H., *Last Sermons in S. Alban's, Holborn* (1915), 170.
 Stone, S. J., *Parochial Sermons* (1901), 222.
 Watson, F., *The Seven Words from the Cross* (1909), 99.
 Wilkinson, J. B., *Mission Sermons*, iii. (1874), 184.
 Wiseman, A., *The Seven Words from the Cross*, 93.
Christian World Pulpit, xli. (1892), 382 (L. Abbott); lix. (1901), 225 (G. Body).

Virginitus Puerisque.

I.

April.

'But we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory.'—2 Co 3¹⁸.

1. One of the grandest things that ever man said about God was the answer given in the Shorter Catechism to the question—'What is God?'—'God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable.' God is *unchangeable*.

Sometimes one may hear good people who have lived a long time, and can look back over many years, speak of God as having been their Friend all the time. 'He has never changed, and I know

¹ J. A. Davies, *Seven Words of Love*, 68.

² W. Newman, *Meditations on the Seven Last Words*, 87.

He never will.' That is what they think; they may even say it.

And haven't you boys and girls noticed how, year after year, the seasons come round—Spring, Summer, Autumn, Winter? Near the beginning of the Bible story we read how God made a beautiful promise to a good man who trusted Him: 'While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.' And He has kept His word. That is in the story of the world—the big story of God as our Creator who is 'unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.'

2. But the Bible gives us another side of God's character. It is that of a loving Father, who understands exactly how His children feel about things. He knows that boys and girls love changes. Men and women are just the same—everybody cries out against monotony; it is hard for human nature to learn to endure it.

The voice of duty may come to a young girl, saying, 'Your work is to help mother after school hours, to nurse your baby brother, to run messages for a frail neighbour.' 'Oh!' we can hear that girl say to herself, 'what a dull life I have, how I should like a change.' We learn patience in strange ways; and it often takes a long, long time; not very many boys and girls know what a lesson in patience really means.

But in this month of April it seems as if the great Heavenly Father were falling in with the very thing you long for. It is the month of changes. Sun, rain! How quickly they follow each other! There is a surprise at every turn, so to speak. Try to think of some of the Aprils you have had. You can remember that there was more than sun and rain in them. Some of you went primrose gathering, or you may have visited a friend who had a large garden with a glorious tree, under which you lay and looked up to the blue sky through a roof of apple blossom.

I remember a sick boy who had a very poor home: but near his bed was a little four-paned window. One April morning he was wakened by something making a rattling noise on the glass. 'Mother lighting the fire,' he said to himself. What do you think it was? It was a branch of apple blossom knocking at the little window. The boy forgot his weariness and actually laughed out loud.

Oh fair to see
Bloom-laden cherry tree,
Arrayed in sunny white,
An April day's delight;
Oh fair to see!

'A surprise at every turn.' Can you recall the old country walks of April? You looked this way, you looked that way; the idea came to you—you thought nobody had ever felt it so strongly before—that the world was beautiful. You looked round in another direction; there was a bank covered with wild hyacinths, and here and there primroses peeped up very modestly from amongst them. The birds sang—they were happy too, for the winter had passed; joy was come.

The earth was cold, hard-hearted, dull;
To death almost she slept:
Over her, heaven grew beautiful,
And forth her beauty crept.

Showers yet must fall, and waters grow
Dark-wan with furrowing blast;
But suns will shine, and soft winds blow,
Till the year flowers at last.

The sky is smiling over me,
Hath smiled away the frost;
White daisies' star the sky-line lea,
With buds the wood's embossed.

Troops of wild flowers gaze at the sky
Up through the latticed boughs;
Till comes the green cloud by and by,
It is not time to house.

Yours is the day, sweet bird—sing on;
The winter is forgot;
Like an ill dream 'tis over and gone:
Pain that is past, is not.¹

3. What makes the wonderful change in April? If it happen to be a dull, cloudy time, it is not so noticeable. To make a lovely April, the earth must hold up its face to the sun. But that is not all. The sun strikes on the bare rocky cliff and there is no response; nothing grows there, the rock seems even harder and more unimpressionable than in the long winter days. It is the life that is in the earth that makes the difference; the April sunshine only awakens it.

¹*Poetical Works of George MacDonald*, i. 374.

In one of the schools of a large town a flower show was held where prizes were given. A little deformed girl had a small geranium given her. The plant grew and had beautiful blossoms. When it was brought to the show, the judges said it was the finest and best in the collection, and they were surprised to hear it had been grown in a gloomy court. But the secret of its beauty came out. The little girl told how she had watched the sun and the plant every day, keeping the geranium in the sun's rays, moving it as the sun moved; and the result was a perfect plant in life and beauty.

4. To-day I should not preach to you if I believed your hearts were like the hard, unimpressionable rocks. There is something in every boy and girl that, in some way or other, answers when God speaks.

It is said that the city of London is built over a bed of chalk, and if a shaft be sunk anywhere within its area, there will spring up a fountain of clear, cool water. It will be as clear and cool amid the squalor and poverty of the East End as amid the mansions of the great and noble.

Boys and girls, we should be thankful for the wonderful 'something' God has put into our hearts. There are young people who have held their faces up to the sunshine of God's love, and their friends could not but notice the wonderful change that took place in their characters. They became just such young men and such young women as the world needs to make it better.

Looking upward every day,
Sunshine on our faces;
Pressing onward every day,
Toward the heavenly places.

5. It is well known that people become like those with whom they live and whom they allow to influence them. That is the idea in our text. Missionaries tell us of the change which Christianity works in the lives of their converts. One lady missionary wrote a very interesting article in which she says that the love of Christ has brought a change even on the *faces* of the women of China, and she quoted a newspaper article in support of what she said. Let me quote a little bit of it. 'To judge from the beatific expression of certain converts I have met, the gospel means to them what the opening of the hatches of a captured slave ship meant to the wretches pent up in its hold.'

6. It is never a case of changing, or becoming like Christ all at once. We are transformed from glory to glory. One must be in Christ's company every day—every hour. It is like keeping our faces constantly towards the sun, and the change is wrought—we ourselves do not know how.

There is a fable told of a statue of an Ethiopian king. It was a huge figure of black stone seated on a throne. The feet were together and the hands pressed on the arms of the throne, as though in the act of starting up, and the face was looking wistfully toward the place of Sunrise. It was as if he watched for the morning; and, says the fable, whenever the first glimmer of the dawn flushed across the horizon and lit the eager face, a strain of music came from the parted lips.

And so may our lives be. Kingsley's verse is a little hackneyed perhaps, but there is a very fine truth in it:

Do noble deeds, not dream them all day long;
And so make life, death, and that vast forever
One grand sweet song.

II.

The Right Kind of Tongue.

'Keep thy tongue from evil.'—Ps 34¹³.

Supposing some one were to present you with a sword and to tell you that you could use it as you pleased, what would you do with it? Well, there are two ways in which you could employ it. First, you could use it to destroy things—to cut open the covering of your mother's chairs or slit her pictures, or even to hurt or kill people. Or, second, you could use it to fight for the right and to defend the weak. Which do you think would be the better way?

Well, each of us possesses a weapon and we can use it in either a bad or a good way—we can use it to hurt and destroy, or we can employ it to help and bless. It is a very powerful weapon and can be very dangerous, so it is important that we should learn to use it in the right way. Now if you look at the text perhaps you will be able to guess the name of the weapon. Yes, it is the tongue, and to-day I want to speak to you about the right kind of tongue.

In the first place, I wish you to realize what an important thing the tongue is. I want you to learn it now and never to forget it, because if you become quite sure of that, you will save yourself

and other people a great deal of trouble. Never think that what you *say* is a small thing. Sometimes it counts more than what you *do*. There are a lot of people going about the world who seem to think that it doesn't matter much what they say, so long as what they do is all right. Some of them are quite kind and well-meaning, and they would be very much surprised if you told them that they were doing much more harm by their words than good by their deeds. Part of our duty to our neighbours is to 'hurt nobody by word,' and yet you hear people saying silly things such as 'words don't hurt.' Words do hurt. They can do a very great deal of harm. They can break friendships, and spoil lives, and sometimes they can even kill. The Bible doesn't let us think that words don't count. It has a very great deal to say to us about the right and wrong use of the tongue.

Now if I were going to tell you all there is to tell about the right kind of tongue, I should be talking for hours, and if you hadn't fallen asleep long before then you would inform me that I didn't know how to keep *my* tongue in order, so I'm going to mention just a few things about it and you can think out the rest for yourselves.

1. First of all, the right kind of tongue is a *well-controlled* tongue. It knows when to be quiet and when to speak. It doesn't blurt out just whatever comes uppermost. It doesn't go on chattering when it ought to be quiet. It doesn't give away secrets that don't belong to it. It doesn't run off at a gallop with its owner like a badly-trained horse.

There is an Eastern proverb which says 'Of thine unspoken word thou art master: thy spoken word is master of thee.' And that just means that so long as we have a thought in our minds it is our own, but if we speak it out it is ours no longer. We can never get it back again, and it is a power against us for good or evil as the case may be.

Boys, flying kites, haul in their white-winged birds,

But you can't do that when you're flying words.
Thoughts unexpressed may sometimes drop back dead,

But God Himself can't kill them when they're said.

2. And secondly, the right kind of tongue is a *true* tongue.

There are two things I want to say about the

true tongue. The first thing is that it is nearly always cowardly to tell a lie. It is better far to suffer for telling the truth than to escape punishment and lose your honour. If you've done wrong own up like a man, don't deny it like a sneak.

The second thing is that there are more ways of telling an untruth than one. What makes a lie is the intention to deceive. You may lie by saying what is true in word but not in sense. And you may lie by consenting to a lie, by being silent when you ought to speak.

3. In the third place, the right kind of tongue is the *pure* tongue, the tongue that does not stoop to repeat any bad stories or nasty jokes; above all, the tongue that does not stoop to the cheap distinction of taking God's name in vain. Boys, just one word. I can't help thinking this is one of the shabbiest and lowest-down tricks you can play. If you heard another boy speaking lightly or disparagingly of your earthly father you would want to knock him down though he were twice your size, and yet you yourself don't hesitate to take your Heavenly Father's name lightly and foolishly upon your lips. And why? To show how brave and daring you are? Surely that is a poor sort of courage which deliberately defies a God who loves you too much to visit you with His judgment. To show how big you are? You deceive nobody but yourself. It is mostly childish men who stoop to such language. It is generally when things are going against them that they use it, and then it serves them instead of the tears of a baby who can't get what it wants.

4. Again, the right kind of tongue is a *kind* tongue, the tongue that prefers to say good about people rather than evil. Never twist and deform your tongue by picking out people's faults and speaking about them. If you hear a nasty thing about any one, don't let it go any farther. If there were no one to repeat nasty stories these stories would soon stop. If you must talk about others, try to find the best things to say about them. Use your tongues to cheer and brighten, and the world will be a great deal happier and better for your having lived in it.

A little word in kindness spoken
Has often healed the heart that's broken
And made a friend sincere.
Then deem it not an idle thing
A pleasant word to speak.

5. And lastly, the right kind of tongue is the *gentle* tongue, the tongue that is not easily roused to anger. There is a right place for anger in this world, and it is a great gift if properly used. Christ was filled with Divine anger when He drove the money-changers from His Father's house. But if we are going to use our tongues constantly in fighting petty squabbles we shall never have the great and noble anger that scorches and burns up the evil in the world. It takes two to make a quarrel, and if one of the two gives the soft answer that turneth away wrath no quarrel can last long.

Can you remember, then, these five things about the right kind of tongue? It must be a *well-controlled* tongue—not given to chattering heedlessly. It must be a *true* tongue—too brave to tell a lie. It must be a *pure* tongue—too proud to stoop to anything mean, or low, or profane. It must be a *kind* tongue that prefers to say good rather than evil, and it must be a *gentle* tongue that turns away wrath.

There is just one thing more I want you to remember, and it is the most important of all. You will never have the right kind of tongue unless you have the right kind of heart, for 'out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.' Our tongues just tell what our thoughts think, and if we want to have the right kind of tongue, the tongue that is 'kept from evil,' we must ask God to give us the right kind of heart.

III.

The Rev. W. S. Herbert Wylie, M.A., has published a volume of nature studies, to which he has given the title of *God's Whispers* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net). The studies were originally given, he tells us, as addresses to children at the Morning Service in St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church of England, Ealing. There is a point, and only one point, in each of them. Take this for an example.

A LESSON FROM THE LIMPET.

There are many animals which have power to cling to objects. One of these is the limpet. You must have seen this shellfish often when you visited the sea-side, and have noticed how tightly and securely it can cling to the rock. The shell is shaped like a hat, broad at the base, and tapering to a point. At the base you will find the big, flat foot of the limpet, which is really a large muscle

that fills the opening. If you manage to get near without disturbing it, you will notice that it sometimes clings to the rock very loosely. It does this by means of a sticky substance it can produce from its big foot. The water then washes all round and through it, and it gets its food from this passing water. If you knock it sharply with a stick or stone, you can get it off the rock. But if it has the least warning of your coming, or if you touch it even the least little bit, you will find that it will settle tightly on the rock, and you cannot move it unless you are exceedingly strong.

How does it do this? How can it cling so tightly? I can, perhaps, best explain it by an illustration. When I was a boy at school we used to play with what we called 'suckers.' If you get a round piece of strong leather and bore a small hole in the centre, and put through a piece of string which has a knot big enough to prevent the end coming through and therefore to fill up the hole, and if you damp the leather and press it firmly on to a flat stone and then pull the string, you will find that the leather will not only stick to the stone, but you can lift it—even if it be a big stone. The explanation is really quite simple. When you pull the string it lifts the centre portion of the leather from the stone, and a vacuum is made (a vacuum is a space where there is no air), the outer part of the wet leather is sticking to the stone, and no air can get to the space you create when you pull the string; the pressure of the atmosphere all around is about 15 lb. on a square inch, and so that weight presses on the leather where the vacuum is, because there is no air inside to resist it, and hence you can lift the heavy stone. The limpet acts in exactly the same way. It contracts the centre of that flat foot and so makes a vacuum, and the pressure of the air on the shell becomes at once so great that you cannot move it in the ordinary way without exerting great strength. There is one method, however, by which you may move it easily: if you can push even a fine needle under the shell till it reaches the vacuum and then draw it out quickly, the air will rush in and destroy the vacuum, and you can remove the limpet.

Now, St. Paul, in his letter to the Romans, told them 'to abhor that which is evil, and to cleave to that which is good' (Ro 12⁹). You and I are to do the same, and just as the limpet clings to the rock, so we ought to cleave to that which is good. We are not simply to cling loosely as the

limpet sometimes does, lest, like it, we be easily removed. We are to cleave—that is to say, we must mean to cling, and try to do it. You and I cannot do this in our own strength alone. We must have help. Just as the limpet needs the help of the air, so you and I need the grace of God. How may we gain the help of the grace of God? By putting ourselves into the condition of mind and heart to receive that aid. The air is always there, but the limpet does not always put himself into the condition to get its help. We must abhor the evil, choose the good, and wish to cling to it. We must desire God's help and look to Him for it, and then He will give it to us, and His grace will do for us what the air does for the limpet.

But beware of the little sins, which will be to you what the needle prick is to the tightly clinging limpet, and which destroys its grip. Little untruths, little disobediences, little acts of unkindness or selfishness, cause us to lose our grip, so that we are swept into the sea of sin and evil.

IV.

Have you ever tried to speak to children on the indwelling of Christ? The Rev. Stuart Robertson, M.A., does so, and does it successfully. He has published a volume of story sermons for children under the title of *Other Little Ships* (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net). To the sermon on the indwelling of Christ he gives the curious title 'In-quaintance.' Let us quote it.

IN-QUAINTANCE.

'Christ liveth in me.'—Gal 2²⁰.

This is the pretty story of how a little child coined a very pretty word.

The child was Hartley Coleridge, son of the great Samuel Taylor Coleridge. One day, when Hartley was five years old, a friend was talking with the boy and his father, and a little girl with whom Hartley used to walk to and from school every day was mentioned. 'Oh!' said the friend, 'is Annie an acquaintance of yours, Hartley?' 'No,' said the boy, and pressing his hand on his heart, he answered fervently, 'she is an *in-quaintance*.'

And on that his father, writing to a friend about it, made this little verse:

Though friendships differ endless in degree,
The *sorts*, methinks, may be reduced to three:
Ac-quaintance many and Con-quaintance few,
But for *In-quaintance* I know only two.

Now I leave it to the boys and girls who read this, to think over the people they know, and put them into their right sort and degree of '*quaintance*': the people you know, yet whose lives just touch yours now and again—*ac-quaintances*; the people you know who are much *with* you, helping you, on your side—*con-quaintances*; and those who are *in* your heart, *in* your thoughts, *in* your prayers, who live *in* you—*in-quaintances*.

But I want to ask you one question, and it is this: What sort of '*quaintance*' is Jesus Christ?

He begins as an *ac-quaintance* with us all when we are children. We read about Him in a book, we learn about Him—what He said, what He did, how He died. We know about Him as we know about other great souls in the far-away past. He is in the past; He is in a book; He is nearly twenty centuries away. We nod to Him over the years, but He is only an *ac-quaintance*.

Then one day—has it come?—it dawns on us that He is living *now*; not shut in a book, not centuries away. Now, in the lives of men, in the world about us, Jesus is living and working now, teaching people to love, helping people to live, redeeming them out of evil ways. In our own homes He lives and works; and most of the things that make us happy there are His doing.

That is better. He is near us. He is *with* us, on the side of the good in us. 'I am with you always,' He said, 'even to the end of the world.' Jesus is a *con-quaintance*.

But that is not enough. Christ *with* us makes our life happy; Christ *in* us makes our life glorious. 'Christ in us, our hope of glory,' says St. Paul, and his life was a glorious life because he was able to say, 'Christ liveth in me.'

When are you going to be able to say that?

When are you going to open your heart to Christ so frankly and widely that He can enter in and live there, so that you will look up at God with Christ's eyes of faith, and on this world with Christ's eyes of gladness, and on men and women with Christ's eyes of love?

When will you be able to give to the question, 'Is Jesus an acquaintance of yours?' that best answer, which it matters all the world that you should give, and give it with a true hand on a true heart: 'No! He is an *In-quaintance*'; 'Christ liveth *in* me.'

Point and Illustration.

Denominationalism.

Mr. Hugh Martin, M.A., has issued, through the Student Christian Movement, a volume containing five short lectures on *The Calling of the Church* (9d. net). Every lecture is a living message spoken fearlessly. In the lecture on 'The Church that is to be,' Mr. Martin says this about denominationalism:

'Whatever has been the case in the past, it is clear that our denominational distinctions in their present form have outstayed their usefulness. The tasks that confront the Church can only be accomplished by utilizing all our resources to the full. We have much need "seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions." Many of them are meaningless on the foreign missionary field, and to seek to transplant them in their entirety is to give grave cause for stumbling. It can hardly be matter for surprise, for example, if a Chinese, on being invited to join the "Dutch Reformed Church of America in China," feels that there is rather more geography than Christianity in the title! In this matter of unity, as in much else, the mission field is happily leading the way, and there are not wanting signs that even at home we are beginning to doubt the wisdom of overlapping and denominational competition, and learning that we are Christians first and denominationalists second. "Who cares about the Free Church," cried Dr. Chalmers, "compared with the Christian good of the people of Scotland?"'

Considerateness.

Short messages for Lent, touching every aspect of sin and repentance, have been issued by Dr. H. C. G. Moule, Bishop of Durham, under the title of *The Call of Lent* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net). There are forty-one messages, L'Envoi, and a closing poem. Out of one of the chapters on 'Sins in Personal Life,' take this on Considerateness: 'We will not forget Considerateness as a "concord with God" in home-life. The steady practice of it is a real, and a sweet, element in the "fruit of the Spirit." I remember a story told me a few years ago by a clergyman-friend on Tyneside, on first-hand authority, that of the mother concerned. She was poor, not strong, a widow, with several children. The eldest was a great lad, out at work.

He came home daily to dinner, and when the dinner was not ready his tired mother was visited with coarse abuse. But the lad "got converted." And how did the miracle of grace come out? Well, at home it came out thus: the young fellow still wanted his dinner, and still it was not always ready. But now, when he found it so, he would "look ever so bright, and say, *Mother, I'll help you get it ready.*" Very simple words, but God was in them. They were a musical concord with the Christ of Nazareth. And their suggestions reach a very long way.'

Isaiah the Highlander.

One of the 'Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications' is a scholarly popular account of *Isaiah: The Prophet and The Book*, by Canon A. Nairne, D.D. (Longmans; 1s. net). It is fit for pleasant reading and it is just as fit for steady study—an accomplishment only the few can attain to. This is how Dr. Nairne handles a difficult bit of criticism:

'Are these visions Isaiah's or only parts of the additional theology of the book? In particular, is Isaiah ix. 1-7 his, or is it, as some would say, a late piece emanating from the Maccabean struggle, when "Galilee of the nations" came into prominence, and the heavily booted soldiers (ix. 5, R.V. margin) of Antiochus oppressed the saints? Perhaps of this conjecture also we may be content to say that it is ingenious, but is it securely founded? There is, however, another possibility. In the Septuagint, the most astonishing part of the prophecy, the series of divine epithets in verse 6 disappears. In place of these we only find "angel of great counsel." May it not be that we have here an instance of the editor of Isaiah's "Life" taking what he might consider an allowable liberty with the record—perhaps itself already confused and uncertain—of his hero's words, and heightening them in accordance with the faith of the Jewish Church? Just that touch, the series of great epithets, would be an interpretation of the primitive Messianic language, in terms of the later development, which was legitimate development, not change. Such a touch would be hardly bolder than the alteration in the text of 1 Tim. iii. 16, "God who was manifested in the flesh," for "He who was, etc.," not so bold as the insertion of the "heavenly witnesses" in 1 John v. 7.'

'And yet, is this conjecture well founded either? The Septuagint, with its merits, has this defect: it is apt to tone down the daring thoughts in which the Hebrew seers delighted. Is not this after all an instance of that toning down? Are not the great epithets consonant with that chord in Isaiah's heart which is all the more surely his because we cannot properly sympathise with it? There is a story of Fiona Macleod which often recurs to me after long hesitation over critical problems like this. He tells of one of his West Highlanders to whom a fairy wish was offered. And he wished for power and wealth immeasurable, and then—"Give me instead," he cried, "give me a warm breast-feather from that grey dove of the woods that is winging home to her young." Fiona Macleod continues: "I tell this story of Coll . . . because he stands for the soul of a race. . . . Below all the strife of lesser desires, below all that he has in common with other men, he has the live-long unquenchable thirst for the things of the spirit. This is the thirst that makes him turn so often from the near securities and prosperities, and indeed all beside, setting his heart aflame with vain, because illimitable desires. For him, the wisdom before which knowledge is a frosty breath: the beauty that is beyond what is beautiful. For, like Coll, the world itself has not enough to give him. And at the last, and above all, he is like Coll in this, that the sun and moon and stars themselves may become as trampled dust, for only a breast-feather of that Dove of the Eternal, which may have its birth in mortal love, but has its evening home where are the dews of immortality" (*Iona: in The Divine Adventure*, p. 106). This analogy does not solve the critical problems of the Book of Isaiah, but it illustrates the soul of Isaiah. For Isaiah and the people he dwelt among were highlanders. Their dreams of empire and their dreams

of the eternal were strangely mingled, or succeeded each other with strange abruptness, and it would be hard to set limits to inspiration on such a soil. Sometimes too it would be hard for readers of an alien race to trace the hidden lines, so different from what we would prefer to draw, along which their idealism runs out to its goal.'

The Great Thought of the Book of Job.

'Whenever a man can say in his heart, This calamity is not anything I have directly deserved, and when he can further say, I have learnt from this suffering all that I am able to learn; and yet it continues—then he is warranted in claiming for his own the great thought of the Book of Job, the thought that his suffering serves some larger purpose of God, such as the vindication of disinterested piety. If we can really believe that, it gives us what we most need; it links our human lives with a divine purpose, just at the point where the purposes of God seem broken off. Pain is transformed into privilege; sorrow becomes the sign of God's approval. God trusts His servant—trusts him with the maintenance of eternal truths, trusts him to stand by them to the last. The trust is itself a reward, the reward of innocence, and the confirmation of piety, as much an honour as the sufferings of Plato's just man crucified. We often speak of trusting God; is there not often a neglected truth in the thought that God is trusting us?'

That is as finely said as it is true and timely. It is found in a small book on *The Cross of Job*, written by Professor H. Wheeler Robinson, and published by the Student Christian Movement (1s. 6d. net). It is characteristic of the book. There is mastery manifest throughout, and no waste of words.

Two Exegetical Notes on St. Paul.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc., D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

I.

A Special Use of ἐν.

PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON has called the preposition ἐν, as used in later Greek, 'a maid-of-all-work' (*Prolegomena*, p. 103). The description is so true that it is often difficult to say at what point one nuance of meaning shades off into another. Hence, the definite interpretation of particular instances must in many cases be hypothetical, and any sensible exegete will hesitate to dogmatize. Still, it may not be labour lost to group together some passages in the Pauline Epistles which seem to gain in clearness and force in the light of a particular explanation of this preposition.

Let us begin with its background. It is well known how often ἐν is used in the LXX as the equivalent of the Hebrew ב. Deissmann, even in the course of a restricted investigation, refers to 253 cases in which this is so. In 174 of these he regards ἐν as 'a mechanical non-Greek imitation' of the Hebrew word. The other usages he classifies under various headings (*Die neuest. Formel 'in Christo Jesu'*, pp. 55, 56). That with which we are concerned does not come within his purview. In all the passages to be cited from the LXX, ἐν is the equivalent of ב. But I should hesitate to call this usage either 'mechanical' or 'non-Greek,' as, although exact parallels outside the N.T. may be difficult to find, it is intimately associated with more or less familiar senses of ἐν.

(a) 2 S 3²⁷: ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἀσαήλ: 'he died for the blood of Asahel.'

(b) Dt 24¹⁶: ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἀποθνήσκει: 'every man shall be put to death for his own sin.'

(c) Ps 68: ἐπαλαιώθην ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς μου: 'I [Heb. mine eye] waxed old because of all mine adversaries.'

(d) Ps 31¹¹: ἡσθένησεν ἐν πτωχείᾳ [LXX evidently read בעני instead of Massoretic בעוני] ἡ ἰσχὺς μου: 'my strength failed because of my wretchedness' [M.T. 'iniquity'].

(e) Ps 42⁹: ἵνα τί σκυθρωπάζων πορεύομαι ἐν τῷ ἐκθλίβειν τὸν ἐχθρόν μου: 'why go I mourning because of the oppression of mine enemy?' In all these examples, ἐν = 'on account of.' When we

consider the close affinity of the meanings 'on account of' and 'by means of,' we need not condemn the usage as non-Greek, even if its Hebrew prototype has not been without influence in suggesting it.

I shall not attempt to discuss Deissmann's confident assertion that Paul was practically free from the influence of the [Hebraistic] syntax of the LXX (*op. cit.*, pp. 67-69). Probably his position is, on the whole, accurate. Yet it would be precarious to leave no room for qualification. That would be to claim a knowledge of Paul's mental habits which is beyond our reach. Let us be content to admit that the Apostle is accustomed to use legitimate Greek constructions, leaving room for the proviso that a usage having a natural kinship with the LXX will not, for that reason, be the less likely to occur.

The following passages from the Epistles become, I think, more luminous if we interpret them in the light of the data set down above.

(a) Ro 1²⁴: διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν: 'wherefore God, because of [R.V. and Moff. 'in'] the lusts of their hearts, delivered them over unto uncleanness.' This rendering explains the psychological sequence of the process far more forcibly than the ordinary one. There seems no need to refer to the exegesis which connects ἐν directly with παρέδωκεν. It is unlike Paul's usage and would be tautological side by side with εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν.

(b) Ro 1²¹: ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν: 'they were made futile because of their speculations' [R.V. 'in their reasonings'; Moff. 'they have turned to futile speculations']. It gives point to the statement to ascribe the futility of their position to their empty cogitations. Although Sanday and Headlam give no hint of taking ἐν as above, they quote a parallel to the passage from Enoch 99⁸, which remarkably confirms the usage: 'they will become godless by reason of the foolishness of their hearts.'

(c) Ph 1¹³: ὥστε, τοὺς δεσμούς μου φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ: 'so that throughout the whole prætorian guard it has become evident that my imprisonment is for Christ's sake [and not for any misdeed].'

This seems immensely preferable to R.V.: 'my bonds became manifest in Christ.' Dr. Moffatt's rendering really amounts to the same thing as mine, for whether he would be willing to give *ἐν* the precise force I suggest or not, he evidently feels that some such interpretation is necessary: 'it is recognized that I am imprisoned on account of my connexion with Christ.'

(d) 1 Co 7¹⁴: ἡγιάσται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναίκί, καὶ ἡγιάσται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ: 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified on account of his wife, and the unbelieving wife on account of her husband.' R.V. renders: 'the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife' ['consecrated in the person of his wife,' Moff.]. The ordinary interpretation is associated with Paul's phrase, *ἐν Χριστῷ*, and suggests that there is between husband and wife, even when one is a heathen, an intimacy of spiritual union similar to that which subsists between Christ and those united to Him by faith. I agree with J. Weiss (*ad loc.*) that it is exceedingly daring to attribute to Paul the equating of *ἐν γυναίκί* with *ἐν Χριστῷ*. Weiss believes *ἐν γυναίκί* to be a case of brachylogy, and explains: 'owing to the fact that the wife is sanctified, the husband is sanctified along with her. . . . Their life together as a whole is the occasion of his being drawn in this way into the sphere of holiness.' This tallies with my suggestion. I do not discuss the conception of holiness which Weiss ascribes to Paul. That does not affect the present question. All that need be added is that one has at least as much right to translate *ἐν* here by 'because of' as (with Weiss) by 'with.'

(e) 1 Co 4⁴: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμὰντῷ σύννοια, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμα: 'for I have no consciousness of blame, but I am not on that account justified.' In this simple instance there is nothing to discuss.

(f) In the following group of examples, the preposition in every case follows the verb *καυχᾶσθαι*, which, in common with other verbs of emotion, like *χαίρειν*, *ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι*, *εὐφραίνεισθαι*, often takes *ἐν* and (much more rarely) *ἐπί* with dative. The corresponding usage in Hebrew, in which the similar class of verbs is followed by *בְּ*, is regarded by Brown, Briggs, and Driver as probably a special case of that which lies behind the use of *in* in the LXX discussed above. At any rate, when Paul declares in Ro 5⁸: ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, the statement gains fresh significance when we render: 'we actually glory because of our tribulations.' And so do the parallel assertions in 2 Co 12⁵: οὐ καυχῶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις: 'I shall not glory except on account of my frailties,' and 2 Co 12⁹, which is virtually a reiteration of 12⁵.

I have not attempted to collect instances of this use of *ἐν* in the N.T. outside the Pauline Epistles. But obvious examples are Mt 6⁷, Jn 16³⁰, Ac 7²⁹. Nor have I had access to Rossberg's dissertation *De praepositionum graecorum in chartis aegyptiis ptolem. aetatis usu* (1909), which might illustrate the usage from the Papyri. W. Schmid in his exhaustive study, *Der Atticismus*, vol. iv. p. 449, refers to Philostratus (II.), *Vitae Sophistarum* 33²¹, where, in the phrase *ἐν οἴνῳ στασιάζειν*, he interprets *ἐν* in a causal sense, as has been done throughout the present discussion. In grammars and lexicons only the fringe of the subject has been touched.

Contributions and Comments.

Literary Authorship.

THE processes of higher criticism are most frequently associated with their use in destroying existing notions of literary authorship, but being true processes their use in a constructive sense is equally legitimate. And being literary, or rather, evidential, processes their value can be tested by their application to modern as well as to ancient literature.

To my mind the familiar differences both in vocabulary and in style between Mr. Carlyle's earlier and later writings have always seemed to be warnings against the popular canon that variety of style and diction necessarily implies variety of authorship.

But I do not write merely to trouble you with these personal and subjective commonplaces. I thought you might be interested by an example from the current number of the *Law Reports* upon

which I happened in reading it for official purposes this morning.

In his judgment in *Macmillan v. London Joint Stock Bank* (1917) 1 K.B. at p. 368, Mr. Justice Sankey, referring to a case decided ninety years ago, says, 'the modern tendency has been to bury rather than to praise it.' No one acquainted with Shakespeare and the Judge can doubt that the phrase is borrowed from *Julius Cæsar*. And to understand it fully needs acquaintance with the earlier writing. The parallel may be accidental, but no reasonable contemporary would suppose that it was. And it would legitimately for later critics date Shakespeare before Sir John Sankey.

But it also indicates that such reference to forgotten writers may often be the key to phrases in popular authors like the prophets of Israel.

There is not much in this, but I believe you have a proverb in Scotland, as shrewd as most of your proverbs are, with reference to the part which little things have in producing great ones.

G. A. KING.

Croydon.

The Virgin Birth.

In the many discussions I have read of the 'Virgin Birth,' there is a point which all the writers have missed, namely, the relation of the Holy Ghost to the propagation of all living creatures. The Nicene Creed entitles Him 'The Giver of Life,' by which we are to understand all life, not spiritual only, the life that results from the 'brooding' of Gn 1 throughout creation. If the function of the Holy Ghost is as described in the Creed, then the existence of every living thing, plant, insect, or animal is due to His creative energy albeit operated through agents, procreators, and subject in a measure to the will of the agents, so far as they possess will and choice. Assuming the One ultimate Originator for each living thing or person, are we to believe that the Holy Ghost 'emptied Himself,' deprived Himself of all power of direct propagation, if the necessity for it should arise? In a word, are we to believe that it became impossible for Him to do directly in one instance that which He is ever doing through agency in every other instance? In the case of Abraham, Gn 18¹⁰⁻¹¹ we are told that it was possible for the procreative power to be quickened by Divine

power, *i.e.* by an operation of the Giver of Life. Its restriction in Gn 20¹⁸ shows that the contrary process was completely subject to the Divine will. Unless we ought to conclude that the recovery of a lost or decayed power was due to Abraham's own initiative, a conclusion at variance with the narrative, we are left with no other alternative than that it was due to an immediate operation of the Giver of Life. God's agents are innumerable, but all combined they do not render Him impotent, unable to do of His own will, directly, what all His agents could never do but for His will and the power received from Him. To deny the Virgin Birth is to me tantamount to denying that the Holy Ghost is the Giver of Life.

A. T. FRYER.

St. James' Vicarage, Walthamstow.

'The Merciful Bystander.'

THE one pitiful deed which redeemed the tragedy on Calvary from utter cruelty was the response made to the cry of Jesus, 'I thirst.' We are not told anything about this unknown benefactor. Can we hazard a guess as to who or what he was?

He was not a Jew. They had already done all they thought necessary. The opiate had been offered and refused at an earlier point. It would be given in His case not for the sake of humanity, but for the sake of formal obedience to immemorial custom.

The vinegar of Jn 19²⁹ was a different beverage. The common drink of the Roman soldiers was sour wine. The soldiers on duty would have their rations with them (Lk 23³⁶), and Dean Farrar supposes the sponge was used as a stopper for the earthen jar in which their 'posca' was kept. Now it is quite reasonable to suppose that no bystander would dare to interfere with the property of the soldiers, especially their drink; hence the natural conclusion would be that the Merciful Bystander was a soldier.

Further point is given to this conclusion by a conjecture revived by F. Field (*Notes on the Translation of the N.T.*, pp. 106-108) quoted in *HBD*, vol. iv. 610^a. He suggests ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες should read ὑσσῶ περιθέντες, 'putting [a sponge] upon a spear.' Here again, if this correc-

tion is accepted, what is more natural than to suppose that one of the soldiers used his weapon as a convenient 'reed' (Mt 27⁴⁸)?

Another consideration in favour of this soldierly chivalry is the change which came over their attitude toward Jesus. At first they mocked Him, but even then 'the soldiers were less persistent in their derision than the rulers' (Plummer, *I.C.C.*, on Lk 23^{36, 37}). At a later stage, when the order came to break the legs of the crucified, they carry out this brutal work not in the order in which the crosses stood, but coming to Jesus last, 'they brake not his legs.' John informs us this was because they saw that He was dead already, and yet 'one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side.' From their point of view this also was an act of mercy.

One other point should be noticed. Throughout the N.T. the Centurions always appear in a favourable light (Lk 7⁹ 23⁴⁷, Ac 10²² 22²⁶ 23¹⁷ 24²³ 27⁴³). The Centurion in charge of these soldiers also makes a confession of faith: 'Truly this man was a son of God.' His faith may have been far from perfect, only as a grain of mustard seed, but it was there and must have been present in his mind before it found utterance. From what we know of military discipline, it will be easy to suppose that with this officer present, no private soldier would have dared to interfere without his command or approval. Hence we reach the conclusion that the Centurion himself was the Merciful Bystander.

Against this view it may be urged that Mark makes him say: 'Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down.' This would certainly seem a confusion, however, and Matthew corrects this by putting these words into the mouth of 'the rest.'

It is an interesting point and one that opens up a wide field for the moralizer. It is not beneath the dignity of a soldier to do something for Jesus Christ. Many are doing that to-day. He still says, 'I thirst,' and the response is not lacking. Moreover, our Lord accepted the offering. He was willing to share a soldier's rations. It may be a comfort to many to believe that the last offering Jesus accepted was that of a soldier.

H. C. VEALE.

West Auckland, Durham.

Babylon in the Talmud.

BABYLON, the great empire of ancient times, had, like all her predecessors, robbed and pillaged¹ in vain; to-day she lies a mass of ruins, only a fitting monument for her memorial career. In her greed for power and aggrandizement, smaller powers were mercilessly destroyed and crushed. In her path of conquest the Jew was not overlooked.² The literature of the conquered nations had not overlooked the sentiments of the conquered peoples, and as a result we find various expressions and passages among the Egyptians, Assyrians, and Hebrews illustrating the above facts. Let us then briefly revert to the Talmud for a more detailed account of the Jewish sentiment towards Babylonia.

The Talmud is very precise in giving its reasons³ why this land is called Babylonia, and is very particular in designating the situation of that land.⁴ One of the reasons why the Jews were supposed to be banished to Babylonia, in contradistinction to the other parts of the world, is because 'it is as deep as Hell.'⁵ From which we may conclude that Israel, having sinned,⁶ was banished⁷ to this terrible place 'in order to purify itself before they would be allowed to come back to their land.'

The Talmud tells us that as soon as an Israelite would come near the boundary of Babylonia⁸ he must utter a curse, because a vulture⁹ stands in Babylonia and is looking at Israel, whom she wants to devour, which of course is another way of saying that Babylonia always had an outlook whereby she might conquer the land of Israel. The Babylonians are not depicted in flattering terms in the Talmud, for they are supposed 'to be flat-heads,'¹⁰ void of all sense and morality. Her average citizen is supposed to be a robber¹¹ of the worst type. Perhaps this is a sentiment handed down by tradition of the terrible way in which the Babylonian troops treated the Jewish population

¹ Winckler, *The History of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 317.

² Comp. Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, vol. i.

³ Sanhedrin, 24a.

⁴ Bava Bathra, 25b.

⁵ Pesahim, 87b.

⁶ See Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 482 ff., 547; Zimmern, *Keilinschriften u. das Alte Testament*, ii. p. 397.

⁷ Comp. Ezk, chs. 16, 23.

⁸ Berachoth, 57b.

⁹ Chullin, 63b.

¹⁰ Sabbath, 31a.

¹¹ Avoda Torah, 26a.

at the time of its conquest. So great was the hatred of the Jew for Babylonia that the Talmud goes so far as to state that even the synagogues¹ that were placed in that country were of no consequence. Nor, on the other hand, is the wisdom of the Babylonian accounted for much, for the sages term it all as foolish.² A Jew was not allowed to go from Israel to Babylonia, according to the Talmudic injunction. A further proof of the hatred of the Jews for Babylonia³ which can be recognized from the Talmud is that after the restoration of the second temple the first fruit⁴ which ought to be brought to Palestine from outside of Palestine—the first fruit of Babylonia was ordered not to be accepted. The Jews in Babylonia did not keep any of the fasts, with the exception of the ninth of Ab,⁵ which is the memorial day on which both the first and the second temple were destroyed. These are some of the sentiments that can be culled from the Talmud with regard to that country,⁶ which laid waste the temple of God and banished the ten tribes⁷ for ever from their lands.

JULIUS J. PRICE.

Toronto, Canada.

1 Cor. xv. 42.

YOUR correspondent (Mr. Kirkland-Whittaker) in the January issue will find an answer to his inquiry on the above passage in the *International Critical Commentary* on 1 Cor. While giving the usual interpretation of 15⁴² in the body of the chapter (making σῶμα ψυχικόν the subject of σπείρεται), a detached note is added in which reference is made to the interpretation adopted by the late Professor Momerie and other scholars. Among those mentioned in the note are Bernard, Charles, Findlay, and Milligan, and we may add Godet and Matheson, all of whom contend that σπείρεται cannot refer to the burial of the corpse in the grave. 'It is possible,' the writer adds, 'that this is correct: nevertheless the marked inclusion of Christ's burial (καὶ οὕτως ἐτάφη) in the short creed given in vv. 3, 4 gives considerable

support to the usual interpretation.' But may not the mention of the burial in v. 4 be intended simply to affirm the *reality* of the death, as not, that is, a swoon, or fainting, as some who said that 'there is no resurrection' may have suggested, but a death with its natural and inevitable sequel—the disposal of the body by burial or otherwise? An entirely different, and quite unrelated, thought is in the Apostle's mind when he comes to write v. 42, so that no clue to its interpretation can be found in vv. 3, 4. The whole subject is discussed in detail in the *Expositor*, 2nd series, vol. v. (Matheson); 4th series, vols. i., ii. (Milligan); and in Matheson's *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*.

WILLIAM CLIFFORD.

West Kirby, Chester.

The Star in the East.

PROFESSOR LAUTH'S theory identifying the star of Bethlehem with the dogstar Sirius which rose heliacally on the first of the Egyptian month Messori for four years in succession (B.C. 5, 4, 3, and 2) is well known; but it has probably been put aside by most modern commentators as neither more nor less satisfactory than many other suppositions. Is it possible that the following passage in Theophrastus' *Enquiry into Plants* has a bearing on the subject?

It will be remembered that two of the gifts brought by the Wise Men were frankincense and myrrh (λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν) (Mt 2¹¹). Now these two aromatic gums are classed together by Theophrastus in at least two passages. In iv. iv. 14 they are simply mentioned among the aromatic plants growing in Arabia, Syria, and India; but in ix. i. 6 they are further referred to as follows: τὸν δὲ λιβανωτὸν καὶ τὴν σμύρναν ὑπὸ κύνα φασὶ καὶ ταῖς θερμωτάταις ἡμέραις ἐντεμνεῖν which Sir Arthur Hort in the new Loeb Classical Library (*Theophrastus*, vol. ii. p. 221) renders: 'The frankincense and myrrh trees they say should be cut at the rising of the dogstar and on the hottest days.' Does this coincidence serve to strengthen the hypothesis that the dogstar (Sirius) was the star seen by the Wise Men? Did they select their gifts in association with the star? Perhaps others far better qualified than I will express an opinion on this matter.

J. W. BALLANTYNE.

Edinburgh.

¹ Megilla, 28b.

² Comp. Yoma, 57a; so also Pesahim, 113b, 88a.

³ Kethuboth, 111a. ⁴ Kalah, ch. iv.; Mishna, II.

⁵ Pesahim, 54b. ⁶ Berachoth.

⁷ Babylonia and Assyria are here used synonymously.

Ἡ ποίημα νουθητικόν of the Pseudo-Phocylides.

THIS Greek collection of proverbs, consisting of an extant metrical piece called *νουθητικόν* (monitory), is wrongly attributed to Phocylides, the poet and philosopher of Miletus, who lived in the sixth century B.C. For a poem of little more than 200 hexameters, the range of its ethical teaching is surprisingly comprehensive. It is most probably of Jewish authorship. No pagan writer could have so exactly reproduced the Old Testament standpoint as to say: 'Boast not thyself of wisdom, or of strength, or of riches: only the one God is wise and powerful and blessed' (cf. Jer 9²³, etc.). The work reveals, moreover, an unmistakable acquaintance with the Pentateuch both in spirit and in detail. The Jewish regulations about marriage, property, etc., are practically repeated here, as are also such distinctive precepts as those against eating the flesh of animals torn by beasts of prey¹ and wholesale harrying of birds' nests.² The view that the writer was a Christian does not rest on very substantial grounds. It is true that the Judaism of the poem is not of a pronounced type; but the same may be said of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus. On the other hand, what Christian writer ever sought to enforce Christian duties under the ægis of a pagan celebrity? In the later Judaism this practice was part of the machinery of proselytism; but it was never adopted by the friends of the Gospel. And what Christian author ever set forth such a colourless Christianity as *ex hypothesi* we have in this work? There is absolutely no reference to Christ's teaching, or to the idea of redemption. Can we regard this as possible in the case of a treatise upon morality? Regarding a future life for the dead, it is said that 'they afterwards become gods';³ but in the light of the context it seems more reasonable to find here the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul than the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. This view is confirmed by the presence of other traces of Greek influence in a poem prevailing Jewish in char-

acter, and calculated in many ways to act as a very wholesome salt in the depraved society of the Hellenistic world.

W. FAIRWEATHER.

Kirkcaldy.

The Prodigal Son.

THE contribution on 'the Prodigal Son' by Mr. Jones in the January issue is interesting and arresting, but it does not completely solve the difficulties of the passage under consideration.

Looking to the phrase 'he came to himself,' which Trench describes as 'words of deepest significance,' we find nothing to show that the son's repentance was incomplete or insincere.

The idea expressed by an eighteenth-century scholar, 'quod patris comitas sermonem filii abrumperet,' gets scant enough attention in most modern expositions of this, the most dramatic of all the parables.

I always make a point of reading v.²¹ disjointedly, as if the words were interrupted by sobs, and v.²² quickly. The *ταχὺ* found in some ancient sources would almost seem to bear out the idea of hasty utterance.

But the most cogent argument in favour of this interpretation is based on the probability that our Lord has not once forgotten His hearers who are mentioned in v.³, and that by this studied interruption of the offer, rehearsed and expected, of service by the son, He is pointedly rebuking the hireling spirit of the Pharisees, who thought to *earn* by their own works that which can be received only of the grace of God.

ALEX. A. DUNCAN.

Auchterless.

'Sheeny.'

WHY is a Jew called by this opprobrious name? The Lexicons and Dictionaries offer no explanation that seems reasonable. Derivations from the German *schinder*, usurer, and the French *chien*, dog, are not satisfying. A Jewish authority tells me that many favour a derivation from 'Shem,' though the change from 'm' to 'n' is difficult. A recent writer suggests that the word is the almost literal equivalent to the Hebrew שֵׁנִיָּה, translated 'by-word,' in Dt 28⁸⁷ and two of the other three passages where the word occurs

¹ Phocylides, vv. 147-148=Ex 22³⁰.

² Phocylides, vv. 84-85=Dt 22⁶. 7.

³ Harnack considers that this points to Christian authorship, but Bernays supposes the original reading to have been *νέοι*, and that this was altered into *θεοί* by a Christian editor.

(1 K 9¹, 2 Ch 7²⁰, Jer 24⁹ *taunt*). This is decidedly tempting. I wonder whether there is anything in it. I understand that it was favoured by Ezekiel Margoliouth, but that it has not found acceptance among Jewish scholars. This last point is not surprising, though, obviously, it does not render the suggestion untrue.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

Toronto.

The Doctrine of Love in Hinduism and in Christianity.

THE study of Comparative Religion has given rise to the demand for a new Christian apologetic. Dogmatic assertions of the uniqueness or supremacy of Christianity will no longer carry conviction. We know now that Christianity is not as unique as it was long imagined to be, or at least not in the same sense. There are many more points of contact between it and other religions than our fathers dreamed. There are few of its characteristic doctrines for which parallels may not be found in one or other of the non-Christian religions. Many even of the Bible narratives, so far as their main features are concerned, meet us again in the sacred books of the East. So much that is genuinely true and noble has been discovered in most of the great religions of the world that many people have hastily jumped to the conclusion that there is very little to distinguish them. They are at best rivals with almost equal claims to the adherence and devotion of men. If we are not prepared to acquiesce in this easy-going conclusion, it is incumbent upon us to inquire anew wherein the uniqueness of Christianity lies, what claim it has to be the one religion which satisfies all the needs of the human spirit, and which contains the final truth concerning God as He may be known by man.

This means that we must frankly accept the challenge to our faith. We must be prepared to submit it to the most searching scrutiny by the same tests that may be applied to the other faiths. We must be perfectly willing to let its doctrinal standards be set side by side with those of Buddhism or Zoroastrianism, or its moral precepts with those of Confucianism. If Christianity is to establish its claim as a universal faith to the undivided allegiance of the human heart, it must do

so in face of an exhaustive and unreserved comparison with every other faith. This does not mean that we must hold our judgment in suspense until we have obtained a complete concatenation of all the elements which are to be found in all the great religions. For our purpose it is enough that we should ascertain what are their essential features. To collect isolated and unrelated elements in these several religions, and to set them side by side would not indeed carry us very far. We must also inquire what is their relative importance in each system, how far they are essential or merely subsidiary, to what extent their absence would materially alter the character of the religion.

There is one feature of the Christian religion which is quite distinctive, and that is the supreme place which the doctrine of love occupies in it. Christianity is the religion of love. On the Divine side it is the revelation of love in the heart of God. The great and wondrous truth it proclaims is that 'God so loved the world.' On the human side it sums up man's entire duty in the obligation to love. If the essence of Christianity could be expressed in three sentences, they would be these: 'God is love'; 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind'; 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' These three sentences set forth the supremacy of love in its threefold manifestations. God as He is finally made known to man in Jesus Christ is seen to be pre-eminently the God of love. The supreme act of worship which man can render to God is to love Him. And the whole complex round of man's moral duties is summed up in the obligation to love. 'For love is the fulfilling of the law.'

Now it is possible that in other religions love may appear in this threefold manifestation. We may find love as an attribute in God; we may come across exhortations to love God; and the duty of loving our fellow-men may be inculcated. But is there any other religion which insists that in each of these three manifestations love is the supreme thing?

In this article we shall endeavour to estimate the place which love as an attribute of God occupies in Hinduism as compared with Christianity. Now, in all the classic literature of Hinduism, the Bhagavad Gita is the one book which gives any prominence to the doctrine of Divine love. 'The Bhagavad Gita is the highest

outcome of Oriental thought and aspiration. It may be called the Gospel of the East.¹ The writer from whom this quotation is taken specifically invites comparison between the Gita and the Fourth Gospel. Now the key-word of the Fourth Gospel is 'love'; and its golden text is 3¹⁶—'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' In it the Incarnation is the manifestation within the limits of time of Infinite and Eternal Love. It not only presents to us a disquisition on love in philosophical terms; but it shows us love in actual operation, ministering to human needs, sharing intimately the sorrows and pains of men, grieving over their sin and folly, suffering with them and for them. We are throughout in an atmosphere pulsating with human emotions. Though the Central Figure in the story is exalted far above the common humanity, He is not a Being apart. He moves about in a world of real men and women (not mere lay figures placed there as a foil to His character), with whom He comes into closest human association. He understands them and sympathizes with them. He enters into their experiences and shares their emotions. He Himself is wearied and thirsty. He enters sympathetically into the simple joys of a marriage feast. He is profoundly affected by the sorrow and pain which men endure; and He weeps with the bereaved. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel, whatever else He may be, is intensely human. He is a Man of like passions with us. He at least is no unmoved spectator of the human tragedy.

In every pang that rends the heart
The Man of Sorrows has a part.

When we turn from the Gospel to the Bhagavad Gita we find ourselves in an entirely different atmosphere. In form the Gita is a dialogue between two superhuman beings. It never once comes into actual touch with human conditions. For all the account that is taken of it here, the world of men might not exist at all. Neither of the heroes of the song comes into vital contact with ordinary mortals in their everyday experiences. There is not the slightest indication of any concern for the sorrows and woes of men. Sympathy and compassion are discounted throughout. When Arjuna confesses his aversion to take up arms

to slay his own kindred, and shrinks from the shedding of blood, his compassionate feelings are denied by the god. There is no trace of tenderness in Krishna. That would be a mark of imperfection, a weakness unworthy of a god. It is an attribute of divinity to be beyond the reach of feeling or emotion, to be unmoved by pleasure or pain, to be indifferent alike to good and to bad. 'I am alike to all beings; to me none is hateful, none is dear.'

Yet the god who is thus depicted for the most part as absolutely impassive is elsewhere in several passages represented as having his favourites upon whom he lavishes his affections. In one passage (12. 13-19) Krishna enumerates to Arjuna the characteristics of his servant who is dear to him, beloved of him, and tells him who of all his devotees is most dear to him. Again, he assures Arjuna that this special revelation has been vouchsafed to him, 'because thou art dearly beloved of me' (18. 64). Thus God does at least love those whose disposition is towards him. He has a special affection for those whose actions, or whose attitude of soul, commends itself to him. We may ascribe to him the words of Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs: 'I love them that love me.'

But nowhere is Krishna credited with the disinterested love which takes no account of man's deserts. There is more genuine humanity in Arjuna than in Krishna. Perhaps the highest contribution that the Bhagavad Gita makes to the doctrine of Divine love is the fact that it testifies so clearly to the human longing to discover in God something akin to the purest human affections. We feel that Arjuna's pity deserves a fuller satisfaction than Krishna is able to give him. He is seeking for a quality which is essentially divine—the love which is disinterested and universal, which flows out towards the undeserving. Robert Browning, in describing the noble passion which thrilled through the soul of David as he witnessed the spiritual torture of King Saul, makes him cry out:

'Behold, I could love if I durst!
But I sink the pretension as fearing a man may o'ertake
God's own speed in the one way of love.'

In the Bhagavad Gita this is what has actually happened. Man has o'ertaken 'God's own speed in the one way of love.'

In Christianity love transcends everything, and is consummated in God. Human love at its

¹ Miss Maud Joynt in the *Hibbert Journal*, October 190 .

purest is but a faint reflection of the Divine love. It is God who has kindled the torch of love in the human heart. It is in loving that man comes nearest to God, and demonstrates most conclusively his kinship with the Divine. 'We love, because he first loved us.' In Hinduism, on the other hand, while love may be the noblest human passion, it cannot exist in God, who is beyond the reach of all passions alike. Love belongs to the pairs of opposites which are transcended in Brahma. In common with every other passion, it is part of that world of illusion which must pass away; and it cannot be properly predicated of the Absolute.

If, then, we find passages in Hindu literature which attribute love to the Supreme, we must regard them as concessions to the immature mind, to the man who is not yet sufficiently advanced in the knowledge of the Absolute. Love cannot be regarded as an essential attribute of God. It is at best but a passing phase of His character. No one reading the Bhagavad Gita could possibly think of summing up the character of the Adorable in the one word 'love.'

The Indian Nation, one of the ablest Hindu journals, took the late Swami Vivekananda severely to task for the address that he delivered at the Parliament of Religions, of which it used these words: 'We cannot help thinking that it exhibits other evils than those of mere compression. It is not merely inadequate, but it is inaccurate, inconsistent, inconclusive. It is amusing to observe how the writer appropriates the doctrines and motives of Christianity and flings them in triumph at the Christian. The doctrine of love may be Hindu, but is also and mainly Christian.'

ROBERT HUGHES.

Uttoxeter.

Acts xxvii. 39.

IN the January issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES the Rev. G. A. Sim replies to my contribution anent this text in the issue of last July. Mr. Sim's article consists of a scholarly restatement of the traditional view of the shipwreck, and incidentally dismisses the view suggested in my article as improbable or impossible.

While not desiring unduly to press my view, which was intended to be tentative and to invite consideration, I desire, with all respect to Mr. Sim

as an authority on questions relating to Malta, to point out, (1) in answer to his statement that 'there is no beach visible from a ship lying at anchor in the open sea opposite the narrow channel where two seas meet,' that it was precisely an excellent view of the bay seen from a ship in the open from the west side of the islet that first led me, years ago, to speculate as to the possibility of another interpretation than the traditional one being given to this text. My recollection is that the coast-line of the bay was clearly visible; and if I seem to be mistaken, the matter can be tested by experiment at some convenient opportunity (not in war time).

(2) Again, referring to Mr. Sim's statement that 'the depth mentioned—15 fathoms—just before anchoring, seems to preclude the idea that the ship came to anchor off the N.-W. side of the islet,' this also is a matter that can be verified by experiment. I do not possess an Admiralty chart, but I recollect making inquiry on this point from a man who had actually taken the soundings, and was informed that the soundings are the same on both sides of the islet.

(3) Yet again, in reference to Mr. Sim's remark that 'it may be judged how impossible it would have been to try to guide the ship into a narrow gap like the channel between Selmûn islet and the mainland, estimated by Smith as not more than a hundred yards in breadth, and that at right angles to the wind,' my whole contention is that the text indicates clearly that the navigators were attempting to do something nearly impossible—'into which they were minded, *if it were possible*, to thrust the ship.'

Further, while in a Gregale (Euroclydon) they would have been at right angles to the wind, it has to be remembered that it was soon after they left Crete that the Euroclydon arose, and that it is an almost unheard-of thing for a Gregale to blow continuously for fourteen days. Usually in the Mediterranean the wind shifts to a different point of the compass every three or four days. If the wind had veered, *e.g.* to N.W., as often happens, the ship, lying off the N.W. of the islet, would have been in the direct line of the wind, and the course suggested in my note a tempting one to a captain whose only alternative was to be driven ashore the moment he let go his anchors.

Mr. Sim's strongest argument is the size of the ship, which, he justly remarks, could not have been handled like a Gozo-boat. The handling

of it would be all the more difficult if the crew were timid or sulky. It is possible that the ship would not answer her helm, but the narrative does not say so. There is excellent anchorage in the bay, and, on the traditional theory, with their anchors still aboard, and the whole bay before them, one wonders by what series of accidents they managed to fall into the place where the two seas meet.

W. COWAN, C.F.

Malta.

Anna, 'a prophetess of the tribe of Asher' (Luke ii. 36).

A CONTEMPORARY of Jesus who could claim descent from any of the so-called 'lost ten tribes' is almost a unique personality in the literature of the early Christian period. Luke's mention of a member of the tribe of Asher as speaking to a circle of 'them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem' about the great importance of the child Jesus raises the question whether there existed in those times Jews who could trace their origin from any of those tribes who were exiled by the Assyrian kings Tiglath-pileser and Shalmaneser (2 K 15²⁹ 17⁶ = 18¹¹). Both the Jewish Hellenistic literature and the Rabbinic sources have to be used in a proper historical setting for the discussion of this problem.

The fact that there existed genealogy-lists among the Jews of those times is well known. Allusion need only be made to the genealogy-lists in Mt 1¹⁻¹⁶ and Lk 3²³⁻³⁸; though these were, of course, drawn up with the obvious purpose of basing the Messianic claims of Jesus as having descended from the Davidic family. An unknown priest had to prove by his pedigree his right to share the priestly privileges (cp. already Ezr 2⁶¹⁻⁶⁸ = Neh 7⁶³⁻⁶⁵). Thus Josephus (*Vita* 1, § 6) in setting down the genealogy of his family states that he found it inscribed in the 'public records' (ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις δέλτοις). Several people mentioned in the Talmud claimed descent from Biblical personages. Davidic origin was claimed by the family of Hillel, who hailed from Babylon, as well as by the Babylonian Exilarchs.¹ Paul also stated

¹ Gen. R. c. 98: 'R. Levi reports, A scroll of pedigrees (ספר גזירות) was found in Jerusalem stating that Hillel was of Davidic family, R. Hiyah descended from Shefatyah b.

that he belonged to the tribe of Benjamin (Ro 11¹, Ph 3⁵).

All these data speak of those tribes that returned from the Babylonian Exile, namely besides Priests and Levites, Juda and Benjamin (Ezr 1⁵ 4¹ 10⁹, Neh 11⁴ 7). But were there Jews in the times of Jesus who could still trace their origin from the so-called 'lost ten tribes'? Rabbinic sources, whether Palestinian or Babylonian, know of no such persons. In considering the literary evidence as to the existence and the whereabouts of these ten tribes in post-exilic times (see Neubauer, *JQR*, i. 14 ff., who collected the greater part of the material), it is well to separate the Judæo-Greek writings from the Palestinian-Rabbinic sources. Some books of the Apocrypha mention Jews belonging to the ten tribes. Tobit was of the tribe of Naphtali (1¹); but the story is supposed to take place in the time of Shalmaneser, the very same king who exiled this tribe. The story of Judith is supposed to have happened not long after the return of the Babylonian exiles to Judea. The author of the book makes Judith as well as her late husband to have belonged to the tribe of Simeon (8¹⁻² 9²). There is also mentioned another member of this tribe, Ozias b. Micha (6¹⁵). In fact, it seems that all the inhabitants of Betylua were, according to our book, probably composed in Maccabean times (see Schürer, iii., 4th ed., 234), of the tribe of Simeon. If this be a genuine tradition, it can be easily explained that, inasmuch as the tribe of Simeon had been absorbed already in early times by the tribe of Juda, some of the returned exiles retained the knowledge of their origin from the tribe of Simeon. The author of 4 Ezra (13³⁹⁻⁴⁷)

Abital . . . R. Jose b. Hulafta from Jonadab b. Rekhab . . . Yer. Taan, 68a, ll. 52-57, has the same list with variants; there are several interpolations in these lists which, however, need not be discussed here (see also Dr. Büchler, *Priester u. Cultus*, 41 ff., and Epstein, *Monatsschrift*, 1896, 141). Both lists agree that Hillel was of Davidic origin. According to Yer. Kilaim, 32b, ll. 37-38, R. Yehuda ha-Nasi, the redactor of the Mishnah and a descendant of Hillel, states that R. Huna, the contemporary Babylonian Exilarch, belonged to the tribe of Juda, and descended from the male members of the Davidic family, whereas R. Yehuda himself belonged to the tribe of Benjamin, but the maternal side of his family had Davidic origin.—Eleazar b. 'Azaryah, a scholar of the first century, was regarded as the tenth generation from Ezra the scribe (Yer. Yebamot, 3^b top; Taan, 67^d, l. 32: cp. Babli Ber. 27^b bottom).—The family of אנשיבא in Jerusalem traced its origin from Aravneh the Jebusite (Yer. Pea, 21a, l. 52).—About the scrolls of pedigree, see further Yeb. 4¹⁵; Babli, 49^b.

had some vague idea of the whereabouts of the ten tribes in a district far away beyond the Euphrates. This country he calls Arzareth, which, as Schiller-Szinessy has pointed out, is a contraction of ארץ אררת, Dt 29²⁷. It is obvious that the author of the book never met a Jew who belonged to one of these tribes. There only remains the statement in the Letter of Aristeas (46 ff.), that the high priest Eleazar selected six scholars from each tribe of the Jews to collaborate in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. The author of the letter was probably an Egyptian Jew who lived not very much later than 200 B.C. (cp. Schürer, iii., 4th ed., 612-613). Only a Hellenized Jew could speak of twelve tribes living in *Palestine* in post-exilic times.

Coming to N.T. times we find, besides Lk 2³⁶, Paul speaking of 'our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night' in the hope of resurrection (Ac 26⁷). James also sends his epistle to the 'twelve tribes which are of the dispersion' (see also Lk 22³⁰ and Rev 7⁴⁻⁸). But the most positive statement is that of Josephus in *Ant.* xi. v. 2, § 133. In speaking of the return of the Babylonian exiles, Josephus writes: 'but then the entire body of the people of Israel remained in that country, wherefore there are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now and are an immense multitude and not to be estimated by numbers.' Josephus several times refers to these Jews beyond the Euphrates (see *Jewish War*, ii. xvi. 4, § 388-389, vi. vi. 2, § 343; *Ant.* xv. ii. 2, § 14 ff., iii. 1, § 39). It is well known that there lived many Jews in Babylon in those times. But did these Jews trace their descent from the ten tribes? And did Josephus ever meet in Jerusalem a Babylonian Jew who came as a pilgrim on the festivals and who would claim his origin from any of these tribes?

We are inclined to answer these questions in the negative, and to assume that Josephus gave only his conjecture that the large number of Jews who lived in Babylon and Media, the countries adjoining the Euphrates, were the descendants of the ten tribes. We find R. Akiba, who lived a generation after Josephus, remarking on Lv 26³⁸ 'And ye shall perish among the nations,' that this refers to the ten tribes that were exiled to Media (*Sifra a.l.*). *Sanh.* xi. 3 (Babli, 110^b) reports a discussion between Akiba and Elieser (b. Hyrcanus) as to whether the ten tribes will ever rejoin the body of Israel in Messianic times (עתידין לחזור); *Tosifta* 13¹², reads חלק לעולם הבא, 'a portion of the future

world').¹ Is it at all likely that these scholars would have ever made such statements about the ten tribes had there been any information in Palestine about the existence of great numbers of Jews beyond the Euphrates who belonged to these tribes? It should be borne in mind that Akiba visited Babylon and Media. We find him at Nehardea (Yeb. xvi. 7), the famous stronghold of the Babylonian Jews (see *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 9). He also preached in גזאקא, Gazaka in Media (Gen. R. c. 33, cp. Aboda Zara, 34^a; a late Talmudic tradition (Kidd. 72^a) makes גזאקא equivalent to נהר נון, 2 K 18¹¹, whither a part of the ten tribes were exiled). Akiba had thus first-hand knowledge about the Jews of Media and Babylon. Moreover, there lived, in Palestine scholars from these countries. The most prominent name is Hillel the Babylonian. The Tannaite Nahum the Median lived in Palestine before and during the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. (see *Ketubot* 105^a; *Nazir* v. 5; *Shabb.* ii. 1). The Jews from beyond the Euphrates were thus well known to the Palestinian scholars of the first and second centuries. And yet such scholars as Akiba and Elieser speak of the ten tribes as lost and unknown to the body of Jewry. These considerations render Josephus' statement very problematic. The same argument applies as well to the detail of Luke about Anna, a prophetess of the tribe of Asher, and to the other references in the N.T. to the twelve tribes.

Edersheim (*Life and Time of Jesus*, i. 200, 4th ed.) refers to Gen. R., chs. 71 and 99, as bearing out Luke's statement. Now in chap. 71, end (see c. 77), Levi and Simeon, scholars who flourished towards the end of the third century, in commenting on Gn 30¹⁸, 'With fortune, for the daughters will call me fortunate,' state that the daughters of the tribe of Asher were beautiful and married priests and kings. The Agadists in their homiletic exegesis of the Bible would describe certain characteristics of the ten tribes without, of course, ever having had direct knowledge about them. The above passage is a case in point. The homiletic explanation of כי אשורני is evident. In the third century, C.E., the Agadists certainly had no genuine tradition as regards priests and kings, whether of pre- or post-exilic times, who married women of the tribe of Asher. JACOB MANN.

London.

¹ About the variants of this discussion, which originally was begun by Elieser and Joshua, younger contemporaries of Josephus, cp. Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, 2nd ed., i. 137. 4.

Entre Nous.

George Jackson.

Professor George Jackson has given the attractive title *Leaves of Healing* (Kelly ; 3s. 6d. net) to a most attractive anthology of prose and poetry. It is a book for the sorrowful, he says, and he dedicates it thus :

TO
THE MEMORY OF
A. W. J.

I have a son, a third sweet son; his age I cannot tell,
For they reckon not by years and months where he is gone to dwell.

There is something for the sorrowful for every day in the year—three hundred and sixty-five items in all, and not a single item that signifies mistaken judgment. Nor is this any surprise. For we know that Professor Jackson has the hearing ear and the understanding heart for all that is true and beautiful in English literature. The only objection to the book is that we are tempted to take more than the daily bread for each day, so that it will not last out to the end of the year. Must we give a specimen? Here is one by an American author.

REQUIESCAM.

I lay me down to sleep,
With little thought or care,
Whether my waking find
Me here or there.

A bowing, burdened head,
That only asks to rest,
Unquestioning, upon
A loving breast.

My good right hand forgets
Its cunning now.
To march the weary march
I know not how.

I am not eager, bold,
Nor strong—all that is past;
I am ready not to do
At last, at last.

My half day's work is done,
And this is all my part;
I give a patient God
My patient heart,—

And grasp His banner still,
Though all its blue be dim;
These stripes, no less than stars,
Lead after Him.

MARY WOOLSEY HOWLAND.

Wilfrid Wilson Gibson.

If there are those who are not yet acquainted with Mr. Gibson and his poetry, it is a pleasure to be the means of an introduction, especially through such a volume as *Livelihood* (Macmillan ; 3s. 6d. net). It is a volume of dramatic reveries. So the author himself calls it, and so it is. Each reverie touches reality and never leaves it. And yet each reverie touches reality in a certain representative way, bringing into view always a worthy ideal, and thus coming very close to that which Watts-Dunton used to call the highest poetry of all, in which the mere individual becomes first representative and then again an individual. Each reverie has a distinct human interest. It is at once a lesson in sympathy and a training of the imagination. It is impossible to quote even the shortest of them. The following about the hills and the heather will, however, do something to reveal their charm as poetry.

And there'd been days among the hills, rare
days
And rarer nights among the heathery ways—
Rare golden holidays when he had been
Alone in the great solitude of green
Wave-crested hills, a rolling shoreless sea
Flowing for ever through eternity—
A sea of grasses, streaming without rest
Beneath the great wind blowing from the west,
Over which cloud shadows sailed and swept away
Beyond the world's edge all the summer day.

The hills had been his refuge, his delight,
Seen or unseen, through many a day or night.
His help was of the hills, steadfast, serene
In their eternal strength, those shapes of green
Sublimely moulded.

Whatsoever his skill,
No man had ever rightly drawn a hill
To his mind—never caught the subtle curves
Or sweeping moorland with its dips and swerves—
Nor ever painted heather. . . .

Heather came
Always into his mind like sudden flame,
Blazing and streaming over stony braes
As he had seen it on that day of days
When he had plunged into a sea of bloom,
Blinded with colour, stifled with the fume
Of sun-soaked blossom, the hot, heady scent
Of honey-breathing bells, and sunk content
Into a soft and scented bed to sleep;
And he had lain in slumber sweet and deep,
And only wakened when the full moon's light
Had turned that wavy sea of heather white;
And still he'd lain within the full moon blaze
Hour after hour bewildered and adaze
As though enchanted—in a waking swoon
He'd lain within the full glare of the moon
Until she seemed to shine on him alone
In all the world—as though his body'd grown
Until it covered all the earth, and he
Was swaying like the moon-enchanted sea
Beneath that cold, white witchery of light. . . .
And now, the earth itself, he hung in night
Turning and turning in that cold, white glare
For ever and for ever. . . .

J. Laurence Rentoul.

It is no time since we had a volume of poetry by Professor Laurence Rentoul of Melbourne. We have now a much larger volume including the other, and containing poems that are better, we think, than any that the other contained, good as they were. There is in particular a series of poems on wells. How beautiful are the incidents associated with wells in the Bible—the well in the wilderness at which they sang that first of Bible songs, the well of Bethlehem, the well by which Jesus sat when the woman of Samaria came to draw water. Professor Rentoul tells the story of all these wells, and of other wells in modern life, in poetry that the preacher will quote in the pulpit. These songs of the well, as well as the book, go under the title of *At Vancouver's Well* (Macmillan; 5s.). For the story of Vancouver's well is told with especial enthusiasm. The whole series ends with this song entitled

THE WELL OF THE HEART.

O Thou—once weary by the well
That lapsed—hast tidings sweet and strange
Of deep well-water, by no dell
Or hill-side found, no grassy grange;
Nor changing, though men buy and sell.
Unless *ourselves* can change!

Ah, Love, the song, by delvers sung
In that old Syrian sun-smit dell,
Sings still. The ages yet are young!
Hearts dig and tire: men buy and sell,
Yet chant, the whispering palms among,
'Spring up, spring up, O well!'

Rabindranath Tagore.

Sir Rabindranath Tagore is surely the sententious philosopher of our day. Is it easy to utter sayings that can stand alone and be both readable and memorable? It must be easy for him, though it may be that he first went through in suffering what he now gives out in these sentences which are truly song. For here are three hundred and twenty-six, after all that have appeared already. Let us quote one page of the book.

'Man is worse than an animal when he is an animal.'

'Dark clouds become heaven's flowers when kissed by light.'

'Let not the sword-blade mock its handle for being blunt.'

'The night's silence, like a deep lamp, is burning with the light of its milky way.'

The title of the book is *Stray Birds* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net).

Elizabeth Bridges.

Verses is all the title that Elizabeth Bridges gives her new volume (Blackwell; 1s. 6d. net). 'Poems' it might have been called, if there is a difference between those words. For there is poetry on every page. This is a fair example:

Of briars and thorns
Weaveth she her gracious garlands,
From barren unkempt pastures
Culleth she her posies so gay.

In every place
Findeth she unquested beauty;
Yea, even in my spirit
Sainthood, the lofty thought not attain'd.

Dorothy L. Sayers.

The title is *OP. I.* (Blackwell; 2s. net). And the dedication is 'To the Stage-Manager of "Admiral Guinea," the Conductor of the Bach Choir, and the Members of the Mutual Admiration Society.' And then the surprise. For this is one of the most poetical volumes which have come from Oxford, whence have come recently many that are poetical. The long 'Lay' in praise of Oxford is itself worthy of a place in the next anthology. Yet it is the poem on Judas Iscariot that thrills us most. It is long; it cannot be quoted here. But this short poem has something of the thought of it.

RECKONING.

I said to the devil one day,
'What is the price that a man must pay?
What is the end of shameful desire?'

He answered: 'Hell-fire.'

'You sell sin for a song,' I said,
'And the day of reckoning is far ahead';
Nor knew that, even when he threatens hell-fire,
The devil is a liar.

For the bitter end of shame
Is not any sort of fire or flame,
But the chill of a scorn too sick for laughter,
Here, not hereafter.

E. A. Mackintosh.

Lt. E. A. Mackintosh, M.C., of the Seaforth Highlanders, has published a volume of poems and given it the title of *A Highland Regiment* (Lane; 3s. 6d. net). Much of it, though not the best of it, is instructed by the War. And the pain of the War—the pain of parting, the pain of death—is always present. Yet out of the midst of the War Lt. Mackintosh would have war go on for ever. There is a defiant attitude—defiant to right living and to repentance—several times expressed. And then comes this:

PEACE UPON EARTH.

Under the sky of battle, under the arch of the guns,
Where in a mad red torrent the river of fighting runs,
Where the shout of a strong man sounds no more than a broken groan,
And the heart of a man rejoicing stands up in its strength alone,
There in the hour of trial; and when the battle is spent,
And we sit drinking together, laughing and well content,

Deep in my heart I am hearing a little still voice that sings,
'Well, but what will you do when there comes an end of these things?'

Laughter, hard drinking and fighting, quarrels of friend and friend,
The eyes of the men that trust us, of all these there is an end.
No more in the raving barrage in one swift clamorous breath
We shall jest and curse together on the razor-edge of death.
Old days, old ways, old comrades, for ever and ever good-bye!
We shall walk no more in the twisted ways of the trenches, you and I,
For the nations have heard the tidings, they have sworn that wars shall cease,
And it's all one damned long Sunday walk down the straight, flat road of peace.

Yes, we shall be raptured again by the frock-coat's singular charm,
That goes so well with children and a loving wife on your arm,
Treading a road that is paved with family dinners and teas,
A sensible dull suburban road planted with decorous trees,
Till we come at last to the heaven our peaceable saints have trod,
Like the sort of church that our fathers built and called it a house of God,
And a God like a super-bishop in an apron and nice top-hat—
O God, you are God of battles. Forbid that we come to that!

God, you are God of soldiers, merry and rough and kind,
Give to your sons an earth and a heaven more to our mind,
Meat and drink for the body, laughter and song for the soul,
And fighting and clean quick death to end and complete the whole.
Never a hope of heaven, never a fear of hell,
Only the knowledge that you are a soldier, and all is well;
And whether the end be death or a merrier life be given,
We shall have died in the pride of our youth—and that will be heaven.

On the road to Fricourt, 1916.

John D. Batten.

It is a very small book that Mr. Batten has published with the title *Poems* (Chiswick Press; 1s. net), but it is all poetry. There is not a weak line; there is not a loose thought. Take this on

PRAYER.

God grant me fellowship with those who pray;
With needy hearts encompassed about,
To turn, in my own need, the selfsame way,
And in this hallowed dark, wherein we grope,
Touch other hands stretched out
In the same hope.

With men who toil for men set me my task.
Unto my failing hands the strength afford
Thou givest to the least of those who ask;
And though ill done my task and oft forgot,
Yet from Thy service, Lord,
Dismiss me not.

Set me where I may hear the song and tread
Of fellow-pilgrims on a quest divine,
And to the gracious feast which Thou hast spread
For men of humble heart and for the poor,
Upon my face, even mine,
Close not the door.

J. C. Squire.

Where on the slopes of Parnassus Hill is the place of the parodist? Very near the base, say most, judging him hastily. But how many of us could write a passable poem in amusing imitation of Mr. Hilaire Belloc, or Mr. W. H. Davies, or Sir Henry Newbolt, or Mr. John Masefield, or Mr. G. K. Chesterton? How many of us could show without confusion how Pope would have written 'Break, Break, Break,' or Sir Rabindranath Tagore 'Little Drops of Water'? But take an example. Do you know the style of Mr. W. H. Davies? Here it is in caricature.

A poor old man
Who has no bread,
He nothing can
To get a bed.

He has a cough,
Bad boots he has;
He takes them off
Upon the grass.

He does not eat
In cosy inns,
But keeps his meat
In salmon tins.

No oven hot,
No frying-pan;
Thank God I'm not
That poor old man.

The title of the book is *Tricks of the Trade* (Secker; 2s. 6d. net).

Three Anthologies.

Mr. Robert Scott has published three small volumes of selected thoughts, under the general title of 'The Golden Harvest Series' (1s. net each). One is entitled *The Charm of Nature*, another *The Sunset of Life*, and another *The Human Touch of Sympathy*. They are all compiled by Mr. J. Ellis, who has had not a little experience in work of this kind. The pages are somewhat crowded, and the quotations are occasionally clipped when they might have been given complete. But there is plenty of good material for the speaker who knows how to use it. Mr. Ellis with his skill in that way might have suggested a text now and then. The following poem by Amelia E. Barr recalls a text too obvious for suggestion.

THE DAYLIGHT JOY.

Does the night pass? Is the morning far?
Before the daylight shines a star,—
Have you seen the star in the sky?
Has the waning moon dropped pale and low?
Has the grey east caught a golden glow?
O earth! is the sunrise nigh?

Before the daylight sings a bird;
Has any listening mortal heard,
In the dawning still and dim,
That joyful song to coming light?
Those notes that in their upward flight
Are like a rapturous hymn?

The star has risen large and clear,
The glorious Day-Star! Far and near
Men hail the glorious sign
That heralds in the brighter day,
The broader thought, the better way,
Once trod by feet divine.

The bird has sung on every shore,—
Glad mortals listen and adore,
And learn the joyful air,—
The song of Love! Clouds break away,
The sunshine hastens up the grey,—
'Tis daylight everywhere!

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.